The QUARTERLY JOURNAL *of* SPEECH

VOLUME XLII OCTOBER 1956 NUMBER 3

PUBLIC ADDRESS IN THE CAREER OF ADLAI E. STEVENSON

Russel Windes, Jr., and James A. Robinson

I

NOT since William Jennings Bryan won the leadership of the Democratic Party in 1896 with his famous "Cross of Gold" speech has public address contributed so much to establishing and maintaining a major party presidential candidate's national prominence as in the case of Adlai E. Stevenson. To be sure, in 1952, when Stevenson was chosen standard bearer by his party's national convention, he possessed the political advantages which accrue to one who has been elected Governor by an unprecedented majority in a state with a large vote in the electoral college. But however great his successes and popularity in Illinois, Stevenson's national following was small in the summer of 1952. Compared to his Republican opponent, whose name had been a household word for a decade, Stevenson was virtually unknown. He had not been identified with any national movement as Wendell Willkie had been in 1940; nor with important legislation as Senator Robert A. Taft had been. No preconvention campaign to acquaint the public with his candidacy had been conducted, as had been done by James A. Farley in Franklin D. Roosevelt's behalf in 1931 and 1932, by Thomas E. Dewey in 1944 and 1948, and by Estes Kefauver, Taft, and Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1952. Consequently, when the Democratic Convention adjourned on July 26, 1952, Stevenson had but three precious months in which to communicate his name and his cause to his countrymen.

It is true that during the spring of 1952 Stevenson had attracted considerable attention by his continued refusal to seek the Presidency. For the most part, however, what the public knew about him prior to his nomination depended on which, if any, of the spate of articles *by* and *about* him they had read in several national magazines between January and June of 1952.[1] In addition,

Russel Windes, Jr., is Director of Forensics at Northwestern University and is planning a doctoral dissertation on the public address of Adlai E. Stevenson. James A. Robinson, a University Fellow in Political Science at Northwestern, is working on a monograph on Mr. Stevenson's career as Governor of Illinois.

[1] The following articles by Governor Stevenson appeared in the first six months of 1952: "Organized Crime and Law Enforcement: Problem for the People," *American Bar Association Journal*, XXXVIII (January 1952), 26-29; "Who Runs the Gambling Machines?" *Atlantic Monthly*, CLXXXIX (February 1952), 35-38; "Korea in Perspective," *Foreign Affairs*, XXX (April 1952), 349-360; "Quizzing Stevenson: An Interview," *United States News and World Report*,

he had appeared on "Meet The Press," the television and radio program, the day following President Truman's announcement that he would not again be a candidate for re-election,[2] and he had made a series of speeches in New York, on the west coast, and in Dallas during April and May. These speeches had fired his party's imagination and undoubtedly led party leaders to a stronger consideration of the man from Illinois. For most Americans, however, an image of him had to be formed primarily through his campaign speeches in the fall of 1952.

In those speeches, which have been described by one standard historical reference as "eloquent and forthright . . . among the most distinguished oratorical efforts in United States political history,"[3] Stevenson was able to raise himself from the comparative obscurity of the Governorship of Illinois to great national popularity. The election result, for which his speeches deserve a large share of the credit or blame, was that, even in defeat, he won more votes than any defeated candidate in history, and only Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1936 and Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1952 received larger endorsements. The demand for copies of his speeches was so great that an edition of fifty of his major addresses was published.[4] RCA Victor issued a long-playing record album of selections from many of his campaign speeches.[5] There were suggestions that he make regular weekly television commentaries on public questions. In short, his campaign speeches were received with popular acclaim rarely accorded political addresses.

After the election Stevenson held no public office. His term as Governor of Illinois expired in January, 1953. If he were to continue a political career, he would have to do so without benefit of a platform or official position from which to act and speak. During the next four years, the electorate would have to judge him primarily by what he would say, not by what he would do. Once more he would be dependent to an uncommon degree on his speeches as the major avenue for creating the public's image of his personality and philosophy.

Six months of world travel provided material for eight articles in *Look*,[6] for a major radio address upon his return from abroad, and for the Godkin Lectures at Harvard in the spring of 1954. Throughout the congressional campaign of 1954 he spoke for Democratic candidates and sought to help pay off his party's debts incurred by his campaign of 1952. Wherever he went in the fall of 1954 his speaking attracted large crowds. After the mid-term elections, and for a period lasting not quite a year, he practiced law in Chicago, participated in a seminar at the Northwestern University Law School, made business trips to Africa and Latin America, and only occasionally returned to the platform for a political speech, a non-partisan lecture, or a commencement address.

XXXII (April 25, 1952), 50-56; "The States: Bulwark Against 'Big Government,'" *Look*, XVI (June 3, 1952); "Lincoln As a Political Leader," *Abraham Lincoln Quarterly*, VII (June 1952), 79-86; "Stevenson and the Independent Cat," *Harper's*, CCIV (June 1952), 65. The articles in the *American Bar Association Journal*, *Atlantic*, and the *Abraham Lincoln Quarterly* were adapted from material originally used in speeches.

[2] For text of this program, see Noel F. Busch, *Adlai E. Stevenson of Illinois* (New York: Farrar, Straus and Young, 1952), pp. 207-222.

[3] Richard B. Morris, ed. *Encyclopedia of American History* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1953), p. 718.

[4] *Major Campaign Speeches of Adlai E. Stevenson 1952* (New York: Random House, 1953).

[5] James Fleming, editor and narrator, "Adlai Stevenson Speaks" (New York: RCA Victor Records, 1953).

[6] *Look*, XVII, issues of May 19, June 3, June 17, July 14, August 11, August 25, September 9, and September 23, 1953.

From the day of his defeat on November 4, 1952, until November 15, 1955, when he formally announced his candidacy for renomination, Stevenson made 111 speeches and published 28 articles, from which he edited two books.[7] Where is there another man in the history of American politics whose public image has been created and sustained so largely by his public addresses?

II

In an effort to learn how Stevenson and his advisers view the role of speeches in politics, we conferred with several members of the Stevenson staff and then with Stevenson himself. What follows is a summary of those talks. The first part of our summary covers Stevenson's early background and training as a public speaker. The second part relates to his own conception of the purposes, importance, and problems of campaign speaking. The third part offers a description of the organization which provides material for him and the method through which his speeches are prepared.

III

Neither as a student at prep school or college did Stevenson have any courses or training in public speaking. When in high school at Bloomington, Illinois, in 1915, he upheld the negative in one debate on the proposition, "Resolved, That the United States Should Free the Philippines." He lost, but today he says, "I don't think I really regretted losing, for I couldn't find it in my heart not to free them." He thinks that perhaps the major reason why he did not debate at Princeton was not that he lacked interest, but that in his time (1918-1922) there was little debate and speaking among undergraduates at the University, not even in the old American Whig and the Cliosophic Societies.

In his senior year at Princeton Stevenson edited the *Daily Princetonian*, and he interrupted his law studies later to work on his family newspaper, the Bloomington *Pantagraph*, for more than a year. He believes the practice of writing and revising required of him during his early journalistic career made an important contribution to the style of his speech composition.

The first major opportunity for him to develop his forensic talents, however, came with his election to the presidency of the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations in the 1930's. At that time the Council was sponsoring prominent speakers from here and abroad in an effort to awaken the Midwest to the gathering storm overseas. Stevenson's job was to introduce visiting dignitaries. Of his feelings towards that job he says: "I was scared to death when I spoke. I still am for that matter." But by what he describes as "hard work and deliberate and diligent discipline" he gradually improved as a public speaker. Indeed, many members of the Council took his introductions to be charmingly spontaneous, when the fact was they had been worked on assiduously.

We asked Stevenson whether he memorized his speeches, and he replied: "I've never been able to memorize word for word. I found I could do much better concentrating on a succession of ideas." Did he wish that he had had more academic training in speech in his early career and did he think public speaking had a place in a liberal education? He replied that, although he had not thought seriously about this question before, he could wish that

[7] The Godkin Lectures were published under the title, *Call To Greatness* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1954). Thirty-two other speeches, lectures, and articles were reprinted in *What I Think* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1956).

there had been an easier way to learn public speaking than he had found. He added that, while some people might think public speaking to be more of a procedural than a substantive study, he felt that, if it increases self-confidence and helps with the communication and understanding of ideas, it would very well be an important addition to a liberal education.

Stevenson recalls several other kinds of early experiences which he thinks have contributed to his interest in public matters and the way he thinks about and analyzes public questions. "For as long as I can remember," he says, "I have been preoccupied with public affairs—probably at the expense of private affairs—I mean business and profesional obligations." His parents took him abroad at the age of twelve. He traveled a good deal in Europe as a youngster, and he also saw a considerable part of his own country during his boyhood. To satiate his "geographic curiosity" he became an avid reader of travel stories and books and magazines on travel. In addition he lived in a highly political-minded family. Both his grandfathers were active in Illinois politics. One was Vice-President of the United States, and the other was an important newspaper editor. Stevenson describes his father as a "politician at heart, though most of the time not a practicing one." Between his father's staunchly Democratic view and his mother's strong Republicanism he was "caught in a constant cross-ruffing of political controversy." As the result of his family political connections his "horizons were enlarged almost from birth by meeting famous people." He remembers especially the vivid impression made on him when he went with his father to visit Woodrow Wilson in 1912 before Wilson's election to the Presidency; and he repeated to us a story he had told before in campaign speeches about the time William Jennings Bryan visited in his grandfather's house:

> Bryan had a gargantuan appetite and a reputation for being a mean trencherman. I decided I was a mean trencherman, too, and would match him for every piece of chicken he could eat. I did! And then we went out to the Chautauqua where Bryan spoke and I fell asleep on the front row, much to the discomfiture of my mother.

Stevenson's early reading was omnifarious. Until adolescence he read almost wholly in the classics, especially in Greek mythology. When he went to Wyoming at the age of fifteen, he became so interested in the West that he began reading all of the "Western books" he could find. "I think I must have read everything Zane Grey wrote. You might say my reading followed the flag. Wherever I went I read about the area and the people I was visiting."

Until fifteen years ago Stevenson continued to read considerably. Since then his reading has been almost wholly "parochial," that is, confined to the law, politics, and international affairs. He does not find that his parochial reading has impaired his sources of political information, but he often feels "hungry and ill-fed" because he cannot read much of what he would like to read. "This I regret very much; it is perhaps the heaviest price I have had to pay for this so-called prominence."

We raised the question whether Stevenson had read any of the classic works on rhetoric, including Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, and John Quincy Adams. He said that he had read Aristotle, Cicero in the Latin, and a "smattering" of Adams' lectures on oratory and rhetoric, but he would not say that he had read them as a "thoughtful, critical scholar"

and modestly claims to be "rhetorically illiterate."

Stevenson has always been interested in political addresses. The greatest speech he can recall having heard was given by Newton D. Baker at the Democratic National Convention in 1924. Baker presented a minority report on the League of Nations plank in the party platform. The resolutions committee had made only an equivocal endorsement of the League, and Baker, in proposing an unqualified endorsement, made an eloquent appeal on behalf of the international organization and the ideals of Woodrow Wilson. "It was," Stevenson recalled, "the most moving speech I think I have ever heard."[8]

Stevenson heard Wilson seldom but has read many of his speeches and books. Franklin D. Roosevelt, of course, he heard many times, and he particularly remembers Roosevelt's "Quarantine" speech in Chicago in 1937. "I suppose I was so deeply impressed because of the drama of the historical moment mixed with the oratory of the speaker," he recalls.

IV

While he considers winning votes the first object of most political speaking, Stevenson's basic purpose as a speaker is to inform, for he believes that, if he can inform the public, he has found the best means of winning votes. He believes that, however successful demogogy may be in the short run, it is morally intolerable and should never be resorted to by the political speaker. "It never succeeds in the long run, and the people who resort to such means soon find that out. The best way to win votes is through reason. People are educable on the issues." When asked whether he believed that a speaker could create conviction by facts and reasoning, Stevenson replied: "If I didn't believe that, I couldn't believe in the democratic process. So my basic purpose in speaking is to inform."

There has been occasional criticism of Stevenson for spending too much time working on his speeches. We asked why speeches mean so much to him and why he thinks them so important to his career. His first reason was that he believes he owes it to the people to communicate as effectively as he can if he is to fulfill his responsibility to democracy. "I think a candidate should work on his own speeches, because that is the best way to acquire the information and the understanding of the issues of the campaign. It is a learning and synthesizing process." Secondly, Stevenson derives much "personal satisfaction" from working on a speech, although he acknowledges that perhaps he cannot see as many people as he would like in a campaign because of the time devoted to speech writing.

When asked for his reaction to the criticism that his speeches lack "the common touch," Stevenson merely sat back in his chair, laughed, and shook his head. He takes with good humor the criticism of his use of humor and with a smile described his reaction to this point as one of "sullen indignation." He said that he does not believe a public figure has to be "solemn and serious about everything." Nor does he believe that he himself "talks over people's heads." The problem, as he sees it, is one of informing the public. If the people have adequate information about public questions, then politicians can't talk over their heads. Summarizing this

[8] For the text of this speech, see "Address of Newton D. Baker of Ohio, in Support of the Minority Report Submitting the Amendment to the League of Nations Plank," *Official Report of the Proceedings of the Democratic National Convention, 1924* (Indianapolis: Bookwalter, Ball, Greathouse Printing Company, 1924), pp. 259-270.

point, Stevenson said: "There are people who talk over my head, scientists for example. I haven't the background and information to understand them. But if I can give the people the information, I don't see that I am talking over their heads."

Stevenson is not only aware of other people's criticism of his speeches, but he has some of his own. His self-criticism is usually about matters of emphasis, about the use of certain illustrations, and about delivery, voice, and timing. He is often concerned over his failure to mention someone or something in a speech. Describing his intense self-evaluation after every speech, he says, "I am always depressed." Yet he adds:

> I shouldn't say that I am never satisfied, but I am always wishing I had done better. I think a speaker really makes four speeches: the speech he thinks about ahead of time; the speech he writes; the speech he gives; and the speech he gives on the way home.

He considers the speech he gave on his return from his world trip in 1953 to be his most important speech between the 1952 and the 1956 campaigns; and he ranks next in order during this period his speech on "massive retaliation" and "McCarthyism" in Miami in the spring of 1954, and his national radio address on the Formosan Crisis in April, 1955.[9] We asked him what he regards as the most satisfying speeches of his 1956 preconvention campaign. He mentioned his convocation address at the University of Minnesota, his speech on the hydrogen bomb before the American Society of Newspaper Editors, his address on the Bill of Rights at a Stevenson-for-President dinner in New York, and a television talk given the night before the primary election in California.[10]

From these questions about Stevenson's conception of the role and importance of campaign speeches, we turned to inquiries about some special campaign speaking problems. For example, we asked, "Should the same speech be made to a television audience as to a party gathering?" This is a problem which has plagued the Stevenson campaign staff for some time, as well as the staff of other candidates. Stevenson himself refers to this problem as "most baffling." It is a problem of communicating to two different audiences in two different situations and in two different moods. A party rally ordinarily is strongly partisan and excited, with the tendency to see things in black and white, and is perhaps little interested in the finer distinctions of reason. The television audience, on the other hand, is much less partisan and in the mood for quite different appeals. Indeed, the appeals to a purely partisan gathering might alienate rather than win large segments of the television audience.

In the past Stevenson has resolved this conflict at times by making a different speech for each occasion, one addressed to the "unseen" audience and the other to the party rally. This, of course, is a taxing solution. The only alternative to it seems to be to direct the speech primarily to the television audience on the theory that it is much larger and that presumably the partisans are already won. Stevenson confesses that there seems to be no satisfactory answer as yet to this problem of political communication.

Another special problem of campaign speaking is that of "whistle-stopping."

[9] John Bartlow Martin, "Adlai Girds for Battle," *Saturday Evening Post*, CCXXVIII (October 22, 1955), 115-118. The dates of these speeches are September 15, 1953, March 7, 1954, and April 11, 1955. For the texts, see *What I Think*, pp. 193-199, 64-71, and 215-224.

[10] The dates of these speeches are March 2, April 21, April 25, and June 4, 1956.

Stevenson regards the whistle-stop as an important opportunity for closer identification of the candidate with the voters, but the identification is not usually a forensic one. That is, what the candidate says is not so important as what the whistle-stop gives him in the way of an opportunity to meet with people in a particular area. Thus he can learn from local officials precisely what issues are troubling local areas.

At most whistle-stops in 1952 Stevenson confined himself to a few minutes of remarks. He insisted, however, upon making speeches at two or three whistle-stops each day and upon attempting in each to say something substantial. For example, he and his staff recall the whistle-stop speech at Reading, Pennsylvania, on October 30, 1952, in which he developed some new ideas about the role of business in American life.[11] "There is always the temptation to do something more than simply satisfy the amenities of the situation," Stevenson says. This urge to say something new several times a day rather than merely to repeat a speech already given perhaps explains why his campaign train was so often behind schedule in 1952.

We asked Stevenson about the role of speeches in presidential preference primaries. After the Minnesota election the press reported that he was making a more "personal" campaign in Florida and California. He and his staff, however, did not regard their campaigns in Florida and California as a radical departure from their strategy in Minnesota. There were fewer speeches each day in Florida and California, and this made it possible for Stevenson to talk a little longer and more deliberately to each audience. He could move into a meeting more casually and more informally and wait around afterward to talk with the people. This he had not been able to do in Minnesota. As a result of the revised strategy, he was given more opportunity to hear from the people instead of having the people merely hear from him. It might be recalled that the "personal" campaign is the kind of campaign that Stevenson had conducted when he was a candidate for Governor of Illinois in 1948. It could hardly be said, therefore, that "beating his opponent at his own game" in Florida and California in 1956 was anything new for him.

[11] For the text of this speech, see *Major Campaign Speeches*, pp. 292-296.

V

Before a speech is written, Stevenson and his advisers discuss the nature of the occasion, the place where the speech is to be delivered, the kind of audience likely to attend, whether radio or television will carry it, and what issues are of current interest and importance.

"The issues," says Stevenson, "almost determine themselves." There are fundamental, basic issues that always persist —those of war and peace, of the relationship of the citizen to his government, of public morality, and of public welfare. The complexity of these issues confronts the political speaker with one of his gravest problems: how to treat the issues fairly and thoroughly without oversimplification and distortion within the short time allotted to each speech. It is tempting for the politician to speak of an issue in broad general terms and to ignore the details in which most people are not interested. Yet Stevenson notes that many thoughtful and well-informed constituents are mainly concerned with details, because "they recognize that the great issues are never finally or completely resolved, and the best that can be done is to work on the details."

In addition to national issues, there

are issues peculiar to local areas, as well as to particular parts of the population. These local or regional issues deserve discussion but ought not to obscure the larger ones. "Ideally," Stevenson believes, "a campaign should be based on issues and speaking in an attempt to put those issues clearly before the people. That is what I have tried to do, and that is what I will always try to do."

Presidential candidates have more opportunities to speak than they can accept, and the decision to speak in one place rather than another is based on an analysis of the political situation. Where, for example, is a statement on civil rights most needed and most appropriate? Where can time best be spent in terms of winning votes? Such questions as these are usually considered and worked at long before the composition and delivery of the resulting speech, for the itineraries of candidates are normally drawn up several weeks in advance.

When these decisions have been made, Stevenson prepares his speech in one of two ways. One method consists in writing a first draft in which he indicates the major theme he wishes to stress, some arguments he intends to make, and the kinds of supporting material he wants to include. This is discussed with those who advise him on issues. Someone will give this draft a "fact check," i.e., will see whether matters of detail, such as statistics, are accurate. Finally Stevenson writes the introduction and the conclusion. This is the method which he applies to almost all major speeches, especially to those dealing with such important issues as foreign policy, civil rights, civil liberties, agriculture, education, social security, conservation, and the national economy.

Stevenson much prefers this method to the second, in which he calls on an assistant or perhaps a friend not on the staff to submit a memorandum. From this he may borrow ideas, phrases, and perhaps whole sentences. But he always edits rigorously, adapting the memorandum to his own style, adding literary allusions and supporting material, and attaching an appropriate introduction and conclusion. His introductions are habitually apt—a reference to local history, a humorous anecdote or incident which occurred some place in the campaign, a mention of a previous visit, or a mention of some family connection in the area. He revises constantly, changing language and sentence structure even after advance copies of the speech have been released to the press. While waiting to speak he may be seen marking his manuscript. Examination of almost any of his manuscripts would reveal penciled corrections of words, sentences, and punctuation, as well as additions, deletions, marginal notes, and underlining for emphasis.

In 1952 Stevenson devoted three to four hours each day to speechwriting. In the 1956 preconvention campaign he did not find it necessary to spend so much time on his speeches, because he had the benefit of a research staff which had been organized and working for more than a year. In his first try for the Presidency, Stevenson had only the five weeks between his nomination in late July and Labor Day to organize a campaign staff. On his second try, he opened a research office several weeks before he announced his candidacy. This grew from a modest beginning into a large, crowded office containing a massive collection of data on virtually every issue likely to emerge in the presidential campaign. Several major daily newspapers, including the New York *Times*, the New York *Herald Tribune*, *Wall*

Street Journal, the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*, the Washington *Post and Times-Herald*, and the Chicago papers are clipped. Almost every magazine covering national and international politics is culled for information likely to be of use at some stage of the campaign. Special memoranda are prepared summarizing the essential facts and issues on major public questions. Such data are organized and filed according to topics running from agriculture to veterans.

Files are also kept on the public statements and record of leading political personalities. A catalogue containing Stevenson's statements on any subject on which he has ever spoken has been assembled. Standard reference works are at hand, including reports of congressional hearings, the *Congressional Record*, the *Congressional Quarterly*, and the New York *Times Index*. State histories are available to provide material on the political and economic interests of local areas, and a full time staff of librarians and secretaries, together with volunteers recruited from among graduate students at the University of Chicago and Northwestern University, keep the files up to date.

VI

Good language and good speaking by themselves do not qualify a man for high office. The case for or against Stevenson must turn on issues other than that of his public addresses. Yet it cannot be gainsaid that effective speaking is an ingredient, an important ingredient, for winning an election and sustaining support. Without eloquence Lincoln and Franklin D. Roosevelt would perhaps not have been Presidents at all, and certainly they would have been very different Presidents. Stevenson's speeches have been vital to his career, and their quality assures him a high place in the history of American public address. As John Mason Brown has written, ". . . Stevenson has already made his invaluable contribution to American politics, regardless of his ultimate fate politically."[12] Or to put it another way, his importance in our time is beyond dispute; the open question is whether his present importance will be lasting.

[12] John Mason Brown, *Through These Men* (New York: Harper and Bros., 1956), p. 140.

ELOQUENCE

Eloquence wants anthracite coal. Coldness is the most fatal quality. Phaedrus-horses, one winged, one not; there must be both. Burke had the high principles (in Chatham never a generalization). Burke dragged them down to facts which he never loses sight of: he had a mania, and yet also gives Mosaic accounts. You must speak always from higher ground. Webster does.

But give us the rare merits of impassivity, of marble texture, against which the mob of souls dashing is broken like crockery falling on stone: the endurance which can afford to fail in the popular sense, because it never fails in its own; it knows what it wants and advances to-day, and to-morrow, and every day, to that which belongs to it.

We shall have to describe these arms in detail, though the highest eloquence must combine them all. Kurroglou had seventeen weapons, and in personal combat was wont to try them all in turn. One should have a great superseding personality.

Ralph Waldo Emerson, *Journals*,
ed. E. W. Emerson and W. E. Forbes
(Boston and New York, 1912), VII, 152-153.

RHETORIC AND HISTORIOGRAPHY

Helen F. North

RHETORIC and history are the two major disciplines created by the Greeks towards the middle of the fifth century B.C. which have the rare distinction of being foreign to Athens. They were born, in fact, at opposite ends of the Greek world, rhetoric in Sicily and history in Ionia. As soon as they found their way to Athens, near the beginning of the Age of Pericles, they began to exert a powerful reciprocal influence. It is important to remember that this influence worked both ways. The ancient treatises on rhetoric emphasize the contributions which history can make to oratory; there were two which the rhetors stress:

1. knowledge of the past, which leads to political wisdom, essential to the deliberative orator ("to be ignorant of what happened before you were born is to be always a child," says Cicero.[1])
2. a treasury of moral *exempla* to be imitated or avoided. Historical *exempla* possess *auctoritas* superior to that of poetical or mythical examples.[2]

The handbooks are less explicit about the contributions of rhetoric to history, and there are no didactic treatises specifically concerned with historiography until we come to Lucian in the second century after Christ.[3] Yet the influence of rhetoric on the writing of history was more varied and extensive than the contributions of history to oratory, as we know from a study of the historians themselves and from scattered observations in the rhetorical *technae*, both Greek and Roman.

There are three reasons for the power and persistence of this influence.

First is the lack of any general theory of prose style in antiquity. The inevitable result was the penetration of rhetorical doctrine into all forms of artistic prose. There was a tendency thus to extend all the rules developed in the study of oratory, but especially the doctrine of the *narratio*, in oratory the "statement of the facts," and history came to be regarded, in the words of Lucian, as an extended *narratio*.[4]

A second reason is the virtual domination by rhetoric of all humane studies in the fifth century B.C. This was not just a matter of style and expression, but something that affected the very foundations of thought, providing guidance for the analysis and reconstruction of historical events. Politics, ethics, the comparison of values in political and social life, all these were in the domain of the Sophists, the original professors of public speaking.

Thirdly, there was a widespread belief in antiquity that the orator was peculiarly competent to write history. The effects of this belief can be traced from the fourth century B.C., when Ephorus and Theopompus emerged from the school of Isocrates, to the Ro-

Helen F. North (Ph.D., Cornell, 1945) is Associate Professor of Greek and Latin at Swarthmore College. *This paper was read in Chicago last December at the meeting of the American Philological Association.*

[1] *Orator*, 34. 120.

[2] See, e.g., Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Epistula ad Pompeium*, Ch. 6 (on Theopompus): The study of the historians is intended to furnish those who write political speeches with examples. Cf. Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria*, 10. 1. 34.

[3] *How to Write History*, trans. H. W. Fowler and F. G. Fowler (Oxford, 1905), II, 126 ff.

[4] *Ibid.*, Ch. 55.

man imperial age, when Quintilian advised the orator to retire at the height of his career and devote himself to writing history.[5]

The avenues by which rhetoric exerted this formative influence were, again, three: the intellectual climate of the ancient world, throughout much of its history; the schools; and the rhetorical handbooks.

In the intellectual climate which has just been described rhetoric was a source of knowledge both about matters dealt with by the historians and about the means necessary to give them artistic expression. This domination operated at various times in the course of antiquity, but it was particularly strong in Athens in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., and throughout the Roman Empire in the age known as the Second Sophistic, when the prestige of the orator was greater than ever before or since, and every form of literature, including poetry itself, approximated the style and aims of epideictic. The extent to which the self-confident and expanding rhetoric of the fifth century affected Thucydides has been suggested by Professor Finley: the aims of the historian may be quite independent of rhetoric, may indeed go far beyond the scope of contemporary sophistic teaching, but his methods of treating his material are often derived from rhetorical patterns of thought and expression current in Athenian public life before his exile—notably his mastery of abstraction, his use of the prevailing modes of argument from probability, from the advantageous, and from nature, his antithetical style, and his technique of explaining motives and giving contrasting views of a course of action through fictitious speeches.[6]

The second and more direct avenue of influence led through the schools, those of the *grammaticus* and the rhetor, and even those of certain fourth-century philosophers who took rhetoric for their province. In the normal Graeco-Roman curriculum, which varied but little from the Hellenistic Age to that of the Second Sophistic, history had a firm place in the schools, but it was never studied for its own sake—always for what it could bring to oratory. Something called *narratio* (in Greek *diegema*) was one of the earliest *progymnasmata* (preliminary exercises) taught by the *grammaticus*. This exercise involved the retelling of some simple episode from myth, poetry, or history, with attention to the Isocratean virtues of the *narratio* (clarity, brevity, and plausibility) and to the six elements of agent, action, time, place, manner, and cause. Although poetical narratives were more common at this stage, there are papyri which contain exercises based on historical episodes as well.[7] Elementary though such exercises were, they laid the foundation for the oratorical treatment of historical narrative. If the *grammaticus*, who usually dealt with poetry, read and commented on any prose authors, they were the historians, Herodotus, Xenophon, Hellanicus, and above all Thucydides in the Greek schools, Livy and Sallust in those of Rome. But prose authors properly belonged to the rhetor; he too listed *narratio* among his preliminary exercises, and Quintilian makes it very clear that it should be historical *narratio*.[8] More-

[5] *Op. cit.*, 12. 11. 4. There are some dissenters: the Younger Pliny held that history and oratory are so dissimilar as to render practice in the one a positive hindrance to success in the other (*Epistles*, V. 8).

[6] John H. Finley, Jr., *Thucydides* (Cambridge, Mass., 1942), pp. 42-73.

[7] See, on the general subject of the curriculum in the school of the *grammaticus*, Henri-Irénée Marrou, *Histoire de l'Éducation dans l'Antiquité* (Paris, 1948), pp. 223-242.

[8] *Op. cit.*, 2. 4. 1-3.

over, the advanced rhetorical exercises in proof and refutation depended on historical incidents for their matter.[9] Quintilian further advises the rhetor to engage in *praelectio,* reading and commenting on historical material, with an eye to style, composition, and emotional appeals. At this stage Livy is preferred to Sallust, for although the latter is the greater historian, one must be more advanced to appreciate him properly.[10] Still later, when the student is approaching the end of his course of study, Quintilian would have him read the historians with great thoroughness, but always for the sake of improving his oratorical style, never with an eye to the values of history per se.[11]

In the fourth century B.C., which saw the perfection of the art of rhetoric, rival theories of composition were developed in the great Athenian schools which mingled rhetoric and philosophy. Both traditions, the Aristotelian and the Isocratean, made notable contributions to the writing of artistic prose, but it was the Isocratean, with its emphasis on the moral purpose of history and the biographical, or in fact encomiastic, method, which had the stronger and more enduring effect on later historians. Isocrates' own addresses were regarded as historical works; and as Professor Ullman has observed, the history of Ephorus was the logical consequence of Isocrates' speeches.[12] Indeed, all the historians connected in any way with this school, Theopompus, Duris, Timaeus, and even some Peripatetics like Callisthenes, display the same characteristics: the excessive use of declamation and digression, especially moralizing digression, the striving for stylistic effect, the display of virtuosity, the introduction of the marvelous and of sensations for their own sake, and the ultimate confusion of history with both oratory and poetry.

After the intellectual background and the schools, the third major avenue of influence was through the treatises written by rhetoricians, and by critics whose primary interest was oratory. Antonius in *De Oratore* complains that there are no precepts for the writing of history in the Arts of Rhetoric,[13] and throughout the entire course of ancient criticism we can find only a few works that are chiefly concerned with historiography, but many contain specific criticisms of particular historians, and some make suggestions about the style in which history should be written or draw comparisons among history, oratory, and poetry, which show a keen awareness of significant differences and a desire to maintain them. Aristotle in the *Poetics* began this tradition with his celebrated distinction between history and poetry,[14] a tradition often ignored in practice by the historians themselves, but generally preserved by the critics. Since history was for the ancients primarily an artistic production, it was subjected to the fundamental principles of criticism developed from the study of oratory and applied to all types of artistic prose. Thus Dionysius' criticism of Thucydides follows the rhetorical categories of Invention, Arrangement, and Style, and "Longinus" illustrates the characteristics of the elevated style with examples chosen from Homer, Plato, Demosthenes, and a wide variety of historians. The crucial figure in the formulation and transmission of the principles of historiography for Rome was Cicero,

[9] *Ibid.*, 2. 4. 18.
[10] *Ibid.*, 2. 5. 18-19.
[11] *Ibid.*, 10. 1. 31 ff.
[12] *Transactions of the American Philological Association,* LXXIII (1942), 25-53.
[13] 2. 15. 62-64.
[14] 1451a36-1451b3. In *Rhetoric,* 1360a35, Aristotle says that historical events belong to the realm of politics, not rhetoric.

who was particularly interested in the stylistic aspects of history, and whose death, according to Nepos, was no less a blow to historiography than to the republic.[15]

It was for a long time customary to accuse Cicero of a conception of history incompatible with rigorous standards of truth, largely on the basis of three passages in his works: the Letter to Lucceius,[16] in which he requests a monograph on his consulship which will pursue eulogy beyond the boundaries of historical truth; the description of history in *De Legibus*[17] as an *opus oratorium maxime;* and the comment assigned to Atticus in the *Brutus*[18] that it is permitted to rhetors to lie *in historiis,* in order to score a point. We now realize that Cicero is guiltless on all three counts: that he, like his contemporaries, distinguished between the writing of history, whose proper aim is truth, and the use of eulogy for purposes of propaganda; that the remark in *De Legibus* meant only that history is an artistic product, worthy of the best efforts of a master of style; and that Atticus was talking about the historical *narratio* practised in the schools of rhetoric, and that, moreover, when he made this statement, he smiled.

Out of the great abundance of doctrine and commentary on history to be found in Cicero's works, there are two points that should not pass unnoticed in the shortest summary. First is the fact that Cicero gives classical expression to the ancient concept of history in its noblest form, when he says in *De Oratore*[19] that the first rule of history is to say nothing false, and the second to suppress nothing true. What follows is a recognition that the perfection of history depends on *res* and *verba*. It was to the second of these elements that most of Cicero's critical comments were directed, for in his eyes the great defect of earlier Roman historians was their failure in embellishment (*exornatio*). They wrote, he asserted, in a bare style whose only virtue was brevity, so that history was not, properly speaking, a department of Roman literature. His sketch of the development of Roman historiography in *De Legibus*[20] is dominated by aesthetic considerations, for it was in this realm that the orator could make his principal contribution.

The second point which must not be overlooked is the tremendous importance which Cicero assigns to the historical *exemplum*—in his speeches, his rhetorical works, and his philosophical treatises. If history is, as he maintains, the *magistra vitae,* it fulfills this function largely through the *exemplum,* the guarantee of the *mos maiorum*. In his orations Cicero makes shrewd use of the *auctoritas* imparted by the historical example, as well as its unique power to embellish and clarify an argument, as a kind of simile. But for Cicero, the mature political thinker, the philosopher of history, in his latest works, the *exemplum* has developed into a vital means of comparing the lessons of the past with his own personal experience.[21] Thus it becomes a mode of historical insight.

Turning now from the historical context to some of the significant ways in which rhetoric influenced history, we will confine ourselves to six: the determination of the aims of history, the use of speeches, the doctrine of the *narratio,* the use of digressions, the introduction

[15] *Veterum historicorum romanorum reliquiae,* ed. H. Peter (Leipzig, 1870-1906), II, 40.
[16] *Ad. Fam.,* 5. 12.
[17] 1. 1. 2.
[18] 11. 42-43.
[19] 2. 15. 62.
[20] 1. 6-7.
[21] See Michel Rambaud, *Cicéron et l'histoire romaine* (Paris, 1953), p. 54.

of the topics of epideictic oratory, and the adaptation of the style of epideictic.

Hellenistic interest in how to write history was lively, and there was much discussion about its purpose. Such discussions are reflected in the critical treatises, in dialogues like that of the Peripatetic Praxiphanes, *Peri Historias,* and most vividly in the prefaces of conscientious historians like Polybius and Livy. Among the aims explicitly stated or implicitly revealed by the histories themselves, a number are rhetorical in origin.

The two aims most commonly set forth are the moral and the didactic. Neither is necessarily the product of the rhetorical tradition, but both are emphasized in the Isocratean school of history and Hellenistic historiography in general. Diodorus describes history as the interpreter of truth, which leads to moral perfection,[22] and the Roman historians are virtually unanimous in asserting the usefulness of examples from the past to rebuke men in the present and guide them in the future.[23] Obviously the moral and the didactic are interwoven. Polybius, who finds in knowledge of the past support for the vicissitudes of life, distinguishes the historian from the tragic poet, who seeks to move and charm his audience, on the ground that the aim of the historian is rather to teach and to persuade.[24] As early as the fifth century B.C., Thucydides admits to a didactic purpose when he says that history is written to show what has happened, because it is likely that such will happen again.[25] Sallust holds that the *memoria rerum gestarum* will inflame the souls of men to emulation.[26] Necessarily allied to the moral and didactic aims is that of persuasion, admitted by Polybius in the passage just quoted. This is clearly a fundamental aim of Tacitus, and to the extent that he pursues such an aim, Collingwood observes, he writes in the spirit of a rhetorician, rather than that of a "serious thinker."[27]

Few historians would admit to the aim of providing entertainment; yet such is a dominant motive with many Hellenistic historians, who, as Professor Ullman points out, confuse history with poetry. Indeed, much Hellenistic criticism accepts this thesis; surely it underlies the statement of Dionysius that the historian should choose a noble subject and one pleasing to the reader.[28] It is on this score that he criticizes Thucydides for mistakenly choosing a subject which involved the downfall of Athens and obliged him to conclude his history on a note displeasing to his hearers. By contrast, Dionysius commends the pleasantness, persuasiveness, and charm of Herodotus.[29]

Often combined with this intent was another, equally implicit, the aim of personal glorification, the display of the historian's virtuosity in the style of the itinerant sophist. This desire for the display of brilliance in declamation, *ekphrasis,* and the other devices of encomiastic oratory was responsible for many of the flaws of Graeco-Roman historiography, and was sharply criticized by the ancients themselves, as when Polybius observes that the historian's duty is not to show off his literary ability, but to investigate and elucidate the facts.[30]

[22] *Praefatio,* 1. 2.

[23] See P. G. Walsh, "Livy's Preface and the Distortion of History," *American Journal of Philology,* LXXVI (1955), 369-383.

[24] 2. 56.

[25] 1. 22.

[26] *De Bello Iugurthino,* 4-5.

[27] R. G. Collingwood, *The Idea of History* (Oxford, 1946), p. 39.

[28] *Op. cit.,* Ch. 3.

[29] *Ibid.,* Ch. 3.

[30] 36. 1. Cf. Quintilian, *op. cit.,* 10. 1. 31.

After the formulation of such essentially rhetorical aims, the most evident debt of history to rhetoric is in the use of fictitious speeches, composed by the historians themselves, even when the authentic address was extant. The debt here is so obvious that we may dismiss the topic with one or two brief observations. The convention was established and forever justified by Thucydides, whose speeches are so far from being mere displays of the author's eloquence as to be an indispensable formative element in his work. After his time, there grew up an aesthetic canon which forbade the historian to include *verbatim* reports of speeches lest they impair the unity of his style,[31] a remarkable instance of the triumph of an aesthetic value over every other consideration. The temptation thus presented was too great for many writers, and no one subject is discussed at greater length by the historians themselves than the proper use of speeches. Polybius again (always a severe critic of the rhetorical style in history) says that the historian must not waste the time of the reader to parade his own talents, and he accuses Timaeus of falsifying intentionally through fictitious speeches.[32] Diodorus censures writers who introduce perpetual declamations and make history a mere appendix to their speeches, yet adds that to omit speeches when they are appropriate is equally inartistic.[33]

Among the traditional "Parts of an oration" only one was capable of ready extension to almost any other form of artistic prose, and ultimately this one, the *narratio* or statement of the facts, was made to embrace even epic poetry.[34] By comparison with such a development, the assimilation of history to *narratio* does not seem far-fetched. Occasionally the *exordium* was also adapted, as when Lucian observed that the historian, instead of seeking by his Proem to render his audience attentive, receptive, and well-disposed, may omit the third and concentrate on the first two.[35] The transition from the Proem to the *narratio* should be easy and natural, he adds, because the whole body of the history is one long narrative. This conception of history as a *narratio* prevails in most ancient definitions: Quintilian distinguishes history from oratory on the ground that the one is intended *ad narrandum*, the other *ad probandum*.[36] It was inevitable that critics should apply to history the three Isocratean virtues of the *narratio*, clarity, brevity, and plausibility, usually rendered into Latin by the adjectives *lucidus*, *brevis*, and *probabilis* or *verisimilis*. They are the basis of Lucian's advice in *How to Write History*, and they appear in every ancient discussion of the scholastic exercise known as *narratio*, which in turn supplied the historian with his earliest models. Some critics added other virtues to the list (grandeur, vivid description, agreeableness),[37] and Theodorus of Gadara subtracted all but plausibility;[38] yet on the whole variations were few. Occasionally it is pointed out that in the writing of history *veritas* should replace *verisimilitudo*.[39] The most misleading of the three virtues as a guide for the historian was brevity, which in its normal interpretation was incompatible with a large-scale history. The failure of most historians to achieve this quality is perhaps responsible for the en-

[31] Polybius, 12. 24, and 36. 1. See B. Walker, *The Annals of Tacitus* (Manchester, 1952), pp. 146-148.

[32] 12. 25a.

[33] 20. 1-2.

[34] Ernst Curtius, *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages* (London, 1953), p. 489.

[35] *Op. cit.*, Ch. 53.

[36] *Op. cit.*, 10. 1. 31.

[37] Quintilian, *op. cit.*, 4. 2. 61-65.

[38] *Ibid.*, 4. 2. 32.

[39] *Rhetores latini minores*, ed. Karl Halm (Leipzig, 1863), p. 588.

thusiasm with which the rhetoricians hail the *brevitas Sallustiana.*[40] Cicero is one of the few to indicate that the *narratio* suitable for history is not identical with the oratorical type.[41]

Closely allied with the doctrine of the *narratio*—in fact a subdivision of it—is the artistic use of digressions, especially of the kind called by the Greeks *ekphrasis,* the description of cities and peoples, rivers and mountains, battles, sieges, and other warlike operations. *Ekphrasis,* which was especially popular during the Second Sophistic, is always treated under *narratio* in the handbooks, and Hermogenes, Theon, and Aphthonius take their examples from Homer and the historians, most often Thucydides.[42] *Ekphrasis* lends variety to the narrative, but because it gave scope to the virtuosity of the writer, the device was grossly abused. Lucian recommends moderation in descriptions of this type; Livy dislikes what he calls *diverticula amoena,* charming little digressions;[43] and Quintilian would even exclude them from the *narratio,* except in special circumstances,[44] but Cicero concedes their usefulness in the historical style, wherein "often a territory or a battle is described."[45] The moderation with which both Livy and Tacitus use this device lends it great effectiveness in their hands, as for example when Livy describes the tragic death of the Capuan aristocracy.[46]

The special affinity between history and epideictic oratory is visible in the use of the topics of praise and blame. In the fourth century B.C., the historians of Philip and Alexander adopt the familiar commonplaces of the virtues and vices which were already traditional in Attic oratory. Lucian says that Theopompus is "more an accuser than a historian,"[47] and Ephorus notoriously interrupted his narrative with moralizing platitudes and indulged a passion for panegyric. All the Isocratean historians show a strong belief in moral training as a function of the historian, while the transmission of ethical precepts as commonplaces in the rhetorical schools led to the convention by which the historian judged leading figures according to the canon of the cardinal virtues and their opposed vices. Examples are so numerous as to make selection difficult: Sallust's condemnation of the greed and luxury which lay at the heart of the Catilinarian conspiracy, Livy's eulogy of the elder Roman statesmen in terms of the Stoic virtues, the habit of Ammianus Marcellinus of summing up the virtues and vices of leading historical figures and assigning appropriate praise and blame—all illustrate the strength of this tradition. Its persistence can also be seen in the historical method most successfully used by Tacitus, which portrays its characters as heroes or villains and endeavors with all the resources of *declamatio* to persuade the reader to accept the truth of such a portrait.

The dangers of this approach, of the confusion of history with encomium, are recognized by Cicero, who asserts in the *Brutus* that Roman history has been corrupted by the funeral laudation.[48]

The other aspect of epideictic to which history bears a close resemblance is the stylistic, with which we come to

[40] Quintilian, *op. cit.*, 4. 2. 45; 10. 1. 102. The development of the concept of brevity as an ideal of style is too complicated to discuss here. For an outline of the history of this "brevity-formula," see Curtius, *op. cit.*, pp. 498 ff.

[41] *Orator,* 36. 124. Cf. Pliny, *Ep.,* V. 8.

[42] *Rhetores graeci,* ed. L. Spengel (Leipzig, 1854), II, 16, 80, 46.

[43] 9. 17. 1.

[44] *Op. cit.*, 4. 2. 103-104.

[45] *Orator,* 20. 66.

[46] 26. 13-14.

[47] *Op. cit.,* Ch. 59.

[48] 16. 62.

the last and greatest debt of history to rhetoric, what Cicero meant when he spoke of the *opus oratorium maxime*. Since all the major critics, except Lucian, speak from the standpoint of rhetoricians whose main interest is the training of orators, they tend to emphasize the differences between the oratorical and historical styles. Occasionally a rhetor will recognize a special historical type (*eidos historikon*) side by side with the three traditional genera,[49] but usually our sources are content with less formal assertions of the distinction, as when Cicero says in the *Brutus* that we do well to imitate Thucydides if we are writing history, but not if we plan to plead cases,[50] or when he criticizes a Greek historian for using a style that was "not so much historical as oratorical."[51]

Positive comments on the style proper to history are scattered. Quintilian refers in a memorable phrase to the *lactea ubertas* of Livy, and other references make it seem likely that he regards this *ubertas* as a characteristic of the historical style.[52] Quintilian is also our source for the statement that history employs a more unusual vocabulary and more numerous figures than does oratory.[53] He finds support in Lucian, who advises the historian to adorn his style with figures, so long as they are not pedantic.[54] Lucian's entire discussion is enlightening, since it considers the needs of history, rather than oratory, yet approaches history through rhetorical criteria. The historian, Lucian holds, should avoid a violent, periodic style, with tortuous argumentation and the rhetorical *deinotes*, and should employ an arrangement that is continuous and a diction that is clear without being too colloquial or too unusual. He should avoid both oratorical cadences and poetical metres.[55] Further illumination on the style proper to history comes from Cicero's advice that it be easy and flowing and free from the *asperitas* of the courts or the sententiousness of the advocate.[56] If any consistent point of view emerges from these, and a multitude of other comments, it is the almost universal insistence that history and oratory are two different things which are always tending to become confused and must somehow be kept separate. Epideictic oratory is the only type which is admitted to have a legitimate resemblance to history, and even here we find no general agreement. Cicero would have history written in the manner of Isocrates and Theopompus. After describing the sophistic style with all its digressions, figures of thought and diction, and declamations, he concedes *"Historia finitima est"* ("History is the next thing to it.")[57] But Timaeus, according to Polybius, denied even this relationship, saying that history is to epideictic as an actual building is to a stage set.[58] Yet in practice the Hellenistic historians and those of the Second Sophistic made epideictic with all its strength and weakness their principal model.

It would be possible to suggest many other debts of history to rhetoric—the psychological analysis traceable to the schools, the emphasis on moral qualities in the historian (once more the *vir bonus*, the good man skilled in speaking, so dear to Cato and Quintilian), the adoption of various rhetorical fig-

[49] Rufus, Spengel, *op. cit.*, 1. 2. 399.
[50] 83. 287.
[51] *Ibid.*, 83. 286.
[52] *Op cit.*, 10. 5. 15.
[53] *Ibid.*, 10. 1. 31.
[54] *Op. cit.*, Ch. 44.
[55] *Ibid.*, Ch. 43-46.
[56] *De Oratore*, 2. 15. 64.
[57] *Orator*, 20. 66.
[58] 12. 28a.

ures such as *enargeia* or "vivid description"—but at least one of the virtues of the *narratio* bids us draw to a close. We must also decline to consider here the ultimate question, to which all this is but an introduction, whether rhetoric was, on the whole, a corrupting or a beneficent influence, save to suggest that much depends on the period and more on the man. When rhetorical history is good, it is very, very good, but when it is less good, it is (perhaps) Velleius Paterculus.

We may conclude with a reminder that there were two essential elements in the ancient concept of history: fidelity to truth and perfection of style—*narratio* and *exornatio*. For the first, history was indebted to no one but Clio (and perhaps Mnemosyne). The second she could hardly have achieved without the help of rhetoric.

RHETORIC AND LOGIC

> While I was intent on improving my language, I met with an English grammar (I think it was Greenwood's), at the end of which there were two little sketches of the arts of rhetoric and logic, the latter finishing with a specimen of a dispute in the Socratic method; and soon after I procur'd Xenophon's Memorable Things of Socrates, wherein there are many instances of the same method. I was charm'd with it, adopted it, dropt my abrupt contradiction and positive argumentation, and put on the humble inquirer and doubter. And being then, from reading Shaftesbury and Collins, become a real doubter in many points of our religious doctrine, I found this method safest for myself and very embarrassing to those against whom I used it; therefore I took a delight in it, practis'd it continually, and grew very artful and expert in drawing people, even of superior knowledge, into concessions, the consequences of which they did not foresee, entangling them in difficulties out of which they could not extricate themselves, and so obtaining victories that neither myself nor my cause always deserved. I contin'd this method some few years, but gradually left it, retaining only the habit of expressing myself in terms of modest diffidence; never using, when I advanced any thing that may possibly be disputed, the words *certainly, undoubtedly,* or any others that give the air of positiveness to an opinion; but rather say, I conceive or apprehend a thing to be so and so; it appears to me, or *I should think it so or so,* for such and such reasons; or *I imagine it to be so;* or *it is so, if I am not mistaken.* This habit, I believe, has been of great advantage to me when I have had occasion to inculcate my opinions, and persuade men into measures that I have been from time to time engag'd in promoting; and, as the chief ends of conversation are to *inform* or to be *informed,* to *please* or to *persuade,* I wish well-meaning, sensible men would not lessen their power of doing good by a positive, assuming manner, that seldom fails to disgust, tends to create opposition, and to defeat every one of those purposes for which speech was given to us, to wit, giving or receiving information or pleasure.
>
> Benjamin Franklin, *Autobiography,* ed. John Bigelow in The World's Classics (London 1924), pp. 22-24.

ROBERT C. JOHNSON'S APPRAISAL OF EDMUND BURKE'S ELOQUENCE

Vernon F. Snow

I

FROM the eighteenth century to the present critics have differed widely in their appraisal of Edmund Burke's eloquence.[1] While some have considered him to be the greatest English orator, others have regarded him as the "dinner bell" of the Lower House. In some instances, the same critic has eulogized his written prose but deprecated his speeches and oratorical ability. Who speaks the truth? Was Burke a masterful orator? Were his speeches well received and effective? Or were his speeches interminable, wearisome, and unconvincing? Since Donald C. Bryant posed and answered most of these questions several years ago in an excellent series of articles on Burke's oratory, and since his conclusions remain virtually unchallenged, it will be unnecessary to reconsider the problem in its entirety.[2] Rather, it is the purpose of this essay to publish and analyze the impressions of a hitherto unknown observer of Edmund Burke.

II

In the fall of 1792, shortly after the creation of the First French Republic, a young Connecticut lawyer by the name of Robert C. Johnson set forth on his much-postponed grand tour. He planned to visit England, the land of his forebears, and Continental Europe, the heartland of Western Civilization. Since his principal object was "self-improvement," as he put it, he carefully charted his itinerary, methodically viewed the great works of man, and faithfully jotted down his impressions in a diary which to date remains unpublished.[3] Determined also to observe "living man and the variety of his character," Johnson encountered in one way or another a host of celebrities, including Tom Paine, Mrs. Siddons, Gouverneur Morris, Sheridan, Fox, Erskine, and the unfortunate Louis XVI. But first and fore-

Vernon F. Snow (Ph.D., University of Wisconsin, 1953) is Assistant Professor of History at the University of Oregon. This academic year he is a Visiting Assistant Professor of History at the University of Wisconsin.

[1] For a careful analysis of Burke's contemporary critics see Donald Cross Bryant, "The Contemporary Reception of Edmund Burke's Speaking," *Studies in Honor of Frederick W. Shipley*, Washington University Studies in Language and Literature, New Series, XIV (St. Louis, 1942), pp. 245-264. For general discussions of Burke's oratory see: Chauncey A. Goodrich, *Select British Eloquence* (New York, 1853), pp. 237 ff; Henry Hardwicke, *History of Oratory and Orators* (New York, 1896), pp. 126 ff; and Robert T. Oliver, *Four Who Spoke Out* (Syracuse, 1946), pp. 60-79.

[2] See Donald Cross Bryant's articles: "Burke's Opinion of Some Orators of his day," *QJS*, XX (1934), 241-254; "Edmund Burke on Oratory," *QJS*, XIX (1933), 1-18; *Edmund Burke and His Literary Friends*, Washington University Studies in Language and Literature, New Series, IX (St. Louis, 1939); and "Edmund Burke: New Evidence, Broader View," *QJS*, XXXVIII (1952), 435-445.

[3] Although the original manuscript of Johnson's diary has been either destroyed or lost, two copies are in existence. The first, transcribed by the author's daughter, Mary Ann (Bayard) Johnson, is owned by Mr. George E. Dix of New York City, while the second, made from the first in 1925, is located in the manuscript collections of the University of Oregon Library. Since the former was separated from the Johnson family papers, and since it has remained in private hands, its existence has been little known for all practical purposes. However, the author of this article has edited the diary and intends to publish it in the very near future. All citations in this essay refer to the marginal pagination in the University of Oregon copy.

most among the luminaries he saw and personally encountered was England's most controversial figure, Edmund Burke, whom he called "the god of my idolatry."[4]

Born in the year that Burke made his maiden speech in Parliament (1766), diarist Johnson belonged to a distinguished Connecticut family that excelled in law, philosophy, education, and politics.[5] His grandfather, Dr. Samuel Johnson, had been the leading exponent of Berkeleian idealism in America and the first president of King's College (Columbia). His versatile father, William Samuel Johnson, who displayed talent in jurisprudence, education, and practical politics, sat in the Connecticut legislature and the Continental Congress, and served as president of Columbia College for over thirteen years. Both of Robert C. Johnson's eminent ancestors praised learning and revered the classical heritage; both traveled and studied in the Old World; both loved the constitution, the literature, and the state religion of Old England; both men, moreover, admired Edmund Burke and his principles.

Johnson lived in the golden age of eloquence. The rhetorical ideal pervaded the college curricula, and most students were acquainted with Pericles' *Funeral Oration,* Plato's *Gorgias,* Demosthenes' *Philippics,* and of course the speeches and writings of Hortensius, Cicero, and Quintilian. Eloquence paved the way to preferment, prestige, and public esteem, while graceful conversation carried much weight in polite society. It was an age of great orators: Mirabeau and Danton in revolutionary France, and Otis, Henry, and Warren in colonial America. Eloquence was at its best, however, in England, where the parliamentary oratorical traditions established by Lord Chatham were carried on by William Pitt, Lord Erskine, and the "triumvirate of Eloquence," to borrow Henry Hardwicke's epithet, namely Burke, Fox, and Sheridan.[6]

In many respects a product of his age, young Johnson possessed a deep appreciation for eloquence. His first tutor, Dr. Samuel Johnson (his grandfather), was a brilliant conversationalist and master of the King's English whose epitaph read:

> For skilled he was to pour the full tide of eloquence along,
> Soft, smooth and sweet, or rapid, bold and strong.[7]

His father, who was "gifted with every external grace of the orator, a voice of the finest and richest tones, a copious and flowing elocution, and a mind stored with eloquent literature," according to one contemporary, "appeared at the bar with a fascination of language and manner which those who heard him had never conceived it possible to unite with the technical address of

[4] *The Johnson Diary,* p. 8.

[5] As there is no single biographical sketch of Robert C. Johnson, his life must be pieced together from the short, isolated published references and unpublished manuscript material. The principal sources are: Milton Halsey Thomas, "The Bible Record of William Samuel Johnson and His Descendants," reprinted from *The New York Genealogical and Biographical Record* (July, 1939), 1-8; Max Farrand, "The Papers of the Johnson Family of Connecticut," *American Antiquarian Society Proceedings,* XXIII (1913), 237-246; William R. Cutter, *Genealogical and Family History of the State of Connecticut* (New York, 1911), I, 209 ff; Herbert Wallace Schneider and Carol Smith Schneider, *Samuel Johnson, President of King's College, His Career and His Writings* (New York, 1929); George C. Croce, *William Samuel Johnson, A Maker of the Constitution* (New York, 1937); and a short sketch of Robert C. Johnson in Franklin Bowditch Dexter, *Biographical Sketches of the Graduates of Yale College With Annals of the College History* (New York, 1885-1900), IV, 247.

[6] Hardwicke, *History of Oratory,* p. 116.

[7] Schneider and Schneider, *Samuel Johnson,* I, 57n.

an advocate."[8] With eloquence in his blood, so to speak, Robert entered Yale College, where he came under the influence of Ezra Stiles, one of the great literary scholars of colonial America. He was, evidently, a superior student at Yale, for at the commencement exercises in 1783 President Stiles selected him to deliver the valedictory oration (in Latin, of course) and participate in a debate on "Liberty of the Press."[9]

After finishing his formal education, Johnson entered his father's law practice and began to demonstrate an interest in politics. Inspired by his father, he favored a stronger and more efficient national government; in fact, during the summer of 1787 William Samuel Johnson, who represented Connecticut at the Constitutional Convention, carefully informed his son of the secret deliberations, the eloquent speeches, and the diverse spirit prevalent at Philadelphia.[10] A few months later, when Connecticut began to act upon the new constitution, Robert made his political debut by campaigning for his father's election to the state ratification convention. With a mixture of pride and enthusiasm the twenty-one year old politician described his maiden speech in a letter to his father:

> Honored Sir: This afternoon I spoke in the town meeting. I observed the outlines of the declaration you read, and chained down the attention of a numerous audience for upwards three-quarters of an hour. Silas Nubbell at the beginning of the debate made a motion, that as I had been much with you, I should be requested to deliver my sentiments of the Constitution. The Proposition was laughed at and rejected. I was then determined I would speak. Major Joseph Walker held me by the arm and said I should ruin everything. I waited until the moderator called for the votes, and then broke from him, jumped over the seats, mounted the pulpit stairs and succeeded beyond my expectations, equal to my wishes, and closed with launching an empire on the sea of glory amidst a general clap of hands. Every one I met shook me by the hand and told me I was an honor to Stratford. . . .[11]

Five years later, hoping to improve himself by travel abroad, this same eloquence-conscious lawyer sought the friendship and advice of Edmund Burke.

Most American colonists regarded the Irish-born statesman as their God-sent brother and friend.[12] It was Burke who championed the cause of the American merchants in Parliament. It was Burke who challenged the colonial policy of the Tory administration in the historic Hastings Trial. And it was Burke who courageously criticized the harsh policies of the Crown in his correspondence and formal writings. Furthermore, Burke's early pro-American speeches, which helped establish his transatlantic reputation, were eulogized by The Great Commoner (Lord Chatham), a colonial hero. Critic of the Tory administration and advocate of conciliation, Burke enjoyed a widespread popularity among colonists of all stripes. He put into words the convictions and feelings of many a patriot, and his discourses on America became, according to Morley, "the most perfect manual in our literature, or in any literature, for one who approaches the study of public affairs whether for knowledge or for practice."[13]

[8] Eben Edwards Beardsley, *The Life and Times of William Samuel Johnson* (New York, 1876), pp. 8 ff.

[9] Franklin Bowditch Dexter, *The Literary Diary of Ezra Stiles* (New York, 1901), III, 55, 79-80, 92.

[10] See Max Farrand, *Records of the Federal Constitution of 1787* (New Haven, 1911), III, 49.

[11] Samuel Orcutt, *A History of the Old Town of Stratford* (Fairfield, 1886), I, 423-424.

[12] For Burke's life see: John Morley, *Burke* (New York, 1879); Robert Murray, *Edmund Burke: a Biography* (London, 1927); and Sir Philip Magnus, *Edmund Burke, a Life* (London, 1939).

[13] Cited in Hugh Law's edition of *Burke's Speeches and Letters on American Affairs* (London, 1908), p. xi.

If Burke's political views appealed to the American merchants and lawyers, his learning and reputed eloquence won the praise of contemporary clergymen, educators, and statesmen. To the latter group he was a friend of knowledge, a student of human nature, a master of exposition. His essay "On the Sublime and the Beautiful" was widely read and highly esteemed in America as well as in England. American travelers in England, like William Samuel Johnson, wrote uncritically of his conversational finesse and brought back stories of his superior speechmaking powers. Many political sympathizers ignored his Irish burr or overlooked his ungraceful delivery, and many of his American admirers formed their opinions through the carefully groomed printed speeches or favorable comments of prejudiced witnesses. No wonder many contemporaries considered Burke a brilliant statesman in the Ciceronian tradition and that some regarded him as the greatest of the English orators!

Like most travelers on the grand tour, Robert C. Johnson followed Bacon's suggestion that the serious traveler should "see and visit eminent persons of all kinds which are of great names abroad." An interview with the eminent Whig orator, he reasoned, would certainly be a means of self-improvement. Although his father had met Burke during the Stamp Act controversy and probably knew him slightly, young Johnson thought it advisable to secure the customary formal letter of introduction from one of Burke's personal friends.[14] Thus, soon after disembarking at Bristol, Johnson managed to meet and dine with Mr. John Noble, a merchant and one-time mayor of the city.[15] The latter faithfully promised to provide the eager American tourist with the necessary credentials and influence.

On December 14, 1792, soon after his arrival in the metropolis, Johnson made his way to Burke's London home for the first of his three interviews with England's renowned statesman. His firsthand account of the initial meeting, probably written in his diary that same evening, reads as follows:

> At noon I delivered my letter to Mr. Burke, whom I found at breakfast in his gown, cap, and slippers. My voice faltered, and every limb trembled on my introduction to this great, wise, celebrated man, the only man since the days of Cicero who has united the talents of writing and of speaking equally well. A man of firmer integrity or of purer principles of patriotism does not exist, or one of more cultivated understanding, or of higher powers of mind to carry that patriotism into effect. Highly flattered was I indeed with my reception; so much attention I have not received since I have been in England. His whole conversation diverted to me, [though] four gentlemen were present, and when I took my leave he followed me to the door, and hoped that he should be permitted to cultivate my acquaintance. Of America he spoke in the highest terms of admiration, and said that we deserved our liberty. Of the situation of France he spoke with the most exquisite sensibility, and with horror of the mad frantic acts of massacre and blood which had polluted that once happy and flourishing kingdom. He is 69 years of age, but has a firm step and from his whole appearance I should suppose him no more than 45, his eye lively, keen and penetrating, his voice strong, and his conversation highly elegant and animated. The single half-hour that I was with him has abundantly repaid me for crossing the Ocean and I love him as a father and venerate him as of a superior order of beings.[16]

[14] William Samuel Johnson, a colonial agent for Connecticut during the Stamp Act controversy, met Burke in England. See Beardsley, *William Samuel Johnson*, p. 59.

[15] Bristol, of course, was Burke's constituency during the debates on American Independence. Noble, one of Burke's constituents during these debates, was elected Mayor of Bristol in 1791, and in all probability occupied that office when Johnson dined with him in 1792. See Ernest Barker, *Burke and Bristol* (Bristol, 1931), and John Latimer, *The Annals of Bristol in the Eighteenth Century* (Bristol, 1893), pp. 338, 440, and 495.

[16] *The Johnson Diary*, pp. 13-14.

Such were the young diarist's first reactions to the man he termed "the god of my idolatry."

Johnson soon found out, however, that first impressions are often false, short-lived, and subject to both mild and drastic modifications. For, shortly after leaving Burke's presence, he proceeded to the House of Commons, bribed his way into the gallery, listened to the speeches of the man he idolized, and then recorded his observations:

> Fox opened the debate in a passionate speech of an hour and a half, his action violent, his manner not graceful, his pronunciation almost disgusting, frequently hesitating, and often repeating the last words of a sentence, but his ideas flowing with rapidity, his information extensive, his arguments powerful and solid, and his language manly and energetic, disdaining all ornament and even elegance. He is indeed an able and an interesting speaker. He was followed by Sheridan whose action, attitude and voice appeared to me much too theatrical to be convincing. His pronunciation was extremely accurate, every word and every syllable had its proper accent and emphasis; but it was the pronunciation of a player, and not of an orator, better adapted to the stage than to the British House of Commons. But of him I will yet give no opinion. He was succeeded in an impassioned speech by Burke whose powers were proved by repeated acclamations of the House, and the uncommon attention he commanded for such a length of time; his action was almost as violent and not more graceful than that of Fox. Shall I dare to say that as a speaker he did not please me, that if I had not known that it was Burke my attention would have been wearied, and that I heard nothing that I expected? No, I will not form an opinion. He frequently spoke low; I heard not the whole; and I have no right to judge. Wyndham was on the floor for an hour, but he spoke so low that I scarcely heard a single sentence. Dundas has a strong voice and a broad Scotch accent, but is a manly and convincing speaker, and I listened to him with pleasure.[17]

Thus, on the floor of Parliament the real Burke did not conform to the ideal image that Johnson had formed in his mind, but rather than venture a hasty, derogatory opinion he decided to give the English statesman another hearing.

A few days later, on December 17, 1792, Johnson again went to St. Stephen's Chapel to hear the parliamentary debates. His observations were equally informative:

> Burke again spoke for an hour. Grave and temperate, pathetic and affecting, he was heard with the deepest attention and frequent bursts of applause. But my wishes, my hopes were by no means answered. I had rather read than hear his speeches if it had been possible. I would have been pleased. I wished it, but I could not.[18]

Upon discovering that other English orators like Erskine and Adams were more grandiloquent than his demigod, the young admirer confessed his disillusionment and disappointment.

Johnson's second personal audience with Burke occurred on December 23, 1792. His recorded impressions, as one might expect, were less laudatory and much more factual:

> *Friday*. Paid visits to Cox, Broome and Izard, and called on Mr. Burke who again received me with frankness and attention of a father. He talked much. Pressed my hand with real or apparent affection, and I was consequently delighted. He said he was unwell, and I wish to God that it was in my power to give him health and happiness. He asked if Washington had not issued a proclamation to impress French ideas of liberty in America, and I "trusted that we had too much good sense in America for the admission of such destructive principles." He insisted on seeing me again, and said he must have a long conversation with me before I left town. His whole mind is at present entirely engrossed by the important question in Parliament, and his time is too valuable for me to trifle with. It is impossible for me to cultivate his acquaintance at present, but on my return from the Continent I will visit him at his farm. I doubt not but that I shall be intimate with him, and even acquire his esteem.[19]

[17] *Ibid.*, pp. 14-15; cf. Hansard, *Parliamentary History*, XXX, 59 ff.

[18] *Ibid.*, p. 16.

[19] *Ibid.*, pp. 18-19.

It seems evident that Burke, undoubtedly pressed for time, cut the parley short but granted his American admirer another interview at some later date.

Shortly before leaving London for revolutionary France, grand tourist Johnson had his third and final conversation with Burke. On February 2, 1793, a few days after the event, he penned the following in his diary:

> I have also again visited Mr. Burke, and was again received with the attention and affection of a father. Again he delighted me with a long conversation, again pressed my hand with real or apparent affection, insisted upon my calling upon him at Beaconsfield, and even promised to learn me the art of oratory. He said I had a warm imagination and an exuberance of excellent language, "that I had forgotten my Greek, and I had woefully neglected my Latin; that I had read a vast deal, ancient and modern authors, but that I had read without any kind of attention to method or order. That my ideas were consequently confused and I dared not hazard them in composition." "For my consolation," that I had few faults which perseverance and undeviating industry would not correct, that it was in my power to become a good speaker, and that his poor assistance should not be wanting. Was I not delighted? I was, I was!—and yet when he sees me again perhaps he will not recall me. He certainly is a little crazy; witness his going to the House of Commons last evening and in the midst of a frantic speech, dashing a dagger upon the floor, and calling upon them to "Behold the arms of anarchy, imported for the destruction of English Liberty." But there is method in his madness. Astonishing are his abilities, and I certainly shall not be wanting on my part to cultivate an acquaintance which at present is my pride and my glory.[20]

Soon after writing these words the youthful traveler crossed the English Channel and commenced his journey through the country that his "pride and glory" had denounced in the *Reflections on the Revolution in France*. Although a discussion of his French travels is beyond the scope of this paper, it is interesting to note that Johnson was surprised, even amazed at times, over the lack of violence, the relative stability, and the general indifference that he encountered in revolutionary France. Nevertheless, concurring with his English hero that the Revolution was an unnecessary evil, he concluded that it was a conspiracy inspired "not by old-fashioned interest, which was under the influence of religion, but *enlightened self-love*."[21]

III

It remains now to analyze Johnson's image of Edmund Burke more fully. What were Johnson's prejudices and preconceptions regarding the controversial Whig statesman? Did these predilections change or remain fixed as a result of his personal experience?

Influenced by anglophilic ancestors who glorified the King's English by an educational curriculum which emphasized oral and written elegance, and by national prejudices which were partial to English Whig leaders, Robert C. Johnson accepted the favorable and somewhat magnified international reputation of Burke at face value. Following the dictates of his preconceptions, he idolized Burke before meeting him personally or seeing him perform in Parliament and, unaware or ignorant of any fault or flaws, anticipated a peerless personage. But his expectations, one must admit, were only partially fulfilled, for Johnson entertained certain doubts and misgivings after conversing with Burke and observing him speak publicly.

Generally speaking, Johnson neither doubted nor seriously questioned the versatility, the motives, or the integrity of his ideal statesman. Without doubt, Burke possessed a keen, brilliant, and highly imaginative mind, and a pleas-

[20] *Ibid.*, pp. 21-22.

[21] *Ibid.*, p. 56.

ing disposition. He was exuberant, frank, and friendly; his conversation was fast-flowing and flawless. Moreover, he was easily accessible and willing to counsel aspiring young men, very rare concessions in the eighteenth century. In short, Johnson admired and esteemed the personal virtues, the superior intellect, and the over-all greatness of Edmund Burke.

As a parliamentary speaker, however, Burke disappointed his American admirer. His speeches were long and involved, his voice was low and indistinct, and his gestures lacked grace. The Whig statesman, furthermore, utilized questionable techniques and tactics on the floor of Parliament. The premeditated "dagger speech," in which Burke drew a dagger from his cloak and hurled it to the floor while denouncing the evils of anarchy, led Johnson, who disapproved and took exception to such theatrics, to call his hero "a little bit crazy."[22] But, at the same time, he felt compelled to admit that there was a method to Burke's madness and that Burke's audience listened attentively and applauded vigorously. Thus, in 1792, after parting ways with both Fox and Sheridan and living to see his ideas overtake the English people, Burke did not—like a "dinner bell"—empty the House of Commons with his lengthy diatribes.[23] Instead, according to Johnson, he was effective despite his advanced age and disputable ways and means of persuasion. The young American, in the final analysis, admired Burke's eloquent composition but disliked his oral delivery; he would rather read than listen to the speeches. Nevertheless, Johnson relished the commendations, respected the criticisms, and coveted the future counsel of Edmund Burke, who promised to teach him the art of oratory.

[22] For a discussion of the dagger demonstration see Magnus, *Burke,* pp. 239-243.

[23] See Bryant's discussion of the "dinner-bell" theory of Burke's eloquence in "The Contemporary Reception of Edmund Burke's Speaking," cited above, note 1.

PASSION AND REASON IN PREACHING

If your Arguments be strong, in God's Name offer them in as moving a Manner as the Nature of the Subject will probably admit: wherein Reason, and good Advice will be your safest Guides: But beware of letting the pathetick Part swallow up the rational: For, I suppose, *Philosophers* have long agreed, that Passion should never prevail over Reason.

As I take it, the two principal Branches of Preaching, are first to tell the People what is their Duty; and then to convince them that it is so. The Topicks for both these, we know, are brought from *Scripture* and *Reason.* Upon the former, I wish it were oftner practised to instruct the Hearers in the Limits, Extent, and Compass of every Duty, which requires a good deal of Skill and Judgment: The other Branch is, I think, not so difficult. But what I would offer upon both, is this; that it seems to be in the Power of a reasonable Clergyman, if he will be at the Pains, to make the most ignorant Man comprehend what is his Duty; and to convince him by Arguments, drawn to the level of his Understanding, that he ought to perform it.

Jonathan Swift, *A Letter to a Young Gentleman, Lately entered into Holy Orders,* (1720).

DISCUSSION IN AMERICAN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

John Keltner and Carroll C. Arnold

DISCUSSION is one of the more recent additions to the Speech curriculum and, by comparison with public speaking, oral reading, or the drama, a late arrival among extracurricular activities and extension and special-service studies. Because its place and character are less firmly established than some of our other divisions of knowledge and practice, it is appropriate to ask, periodically, what status it has in the colleges and universities of the country. This is the question to which the Committee on Discussion and Group Methods of the Speech Association of America addressed itself in nationwide surveys in 1949-50 and 1953-54.[1]

Although the results of the Committee's surveys were distributed to officers of the Association and to some 250 members who requested them, we believe that a selective review of some of the findings will be of interest to the readers of this journal and so will help more members of the profession than we could hope to reach by sending out copies of the original reports. Taken altogether, the results of the surveys help to define the status of an increasingly important area of study, to reflect changes in pedagogical and administrative policies, and to suggest directions in which research might well be guided.

In 1949-50, 590 questionnaires were sent to colleges and universities known to offer courses in Speech; in 1953-54, 500 comparable questionnaires were similarly distributed. Responses were returned by 259 (43%) of the institutions queried in 1949-50 and by 243 (48.8%) in 1953-54. The two surveys differed chiefly in the following respects: a) some questions were asked in the second survey that had not been asked in the first; b) a special effort was made to insure representative geographical sampling in the second survey; and c) in 1953-54, responses from institutions with enrollments below 1,000 (Class I), from 1,000-1,999 (Class II), from 2,000-3,999 (Class III), and 4,000 or above (Class IV) were separately analyzed. The two surveys were thus not comparable in all respects, and it is especially important that the findings not be taken to represent the status of discussion in a single group of identical colleges and universities. On the other hand, samples seem sufficiently large and the questionnaires sufficiently similar to justify accepting the results as approximately true to the actual status of discussion *in those institutions where discussion might reasonably be expected to hold place in curricular and extracurricular programs.*

One of the questions asked for the

John Keltner (Ph.D., Northwestern, 1947) is Professor of Speech and Head of his department at Kansas State College. Carroll C. Arnold (Ph.D., State University of Iowa, 1942) is Associate Professor of Speech at Cornell University.

[1] Both surveys were conducted with financial assistance from the Speech Association of America and were under the general supervision of John Keltner. Members of the sponsoring and assisting committee were: Martin P. Andersen, Carroll C. Arnold, Dean Barnlund, Henry L. Ewbank, Sr., Kim Giffin, Franklyn S. Haiman, Russell Jenkins, N. Edd Miller, Helen Schrader, and William E. Utterback.

first time in 1953-54 produced interesting general information concerning the status of divisions and departments of Speech. Each school was asked to indicate the number of Speech teachers employed and the number of students currently majoring in Speech. The replies are summarized in Table I. Aside from revealing the distribution of replies received in 1953-54, these data yield the incidental information that somewhat more than 1 per cent of the average number of students attending the schools surveyed are majoring in Speech. This estimate cannot, of course, be taken as describing the percentage of Speech majors in American higher education, for only those institutions having regularly appointed chairmen or heads of academic divisions of Speech were queried.

TABLE I

NUMBER OF SCHOOLS REPORTING, WITH ENROLLMENTS, NUMBER OF SPEECH TEACHERS, AND MAJORS

	Schools Reporting	Average Enrollment	Avg. No. Speech Tchrs.	Avg. No. Speech Majors
Class I	77	570	2.0	8.9
Class II	57	1290	3.2	15.5
Class III	39	2710	6.4	33.3
Class IV	70	8650	13.2	90.0
Total	243	3370	6.3	37.7*

*1+% of average enrollment of all schools.

Turning more specifically to the character of instruction in discussion, we find that the number of discussion courses significantly increased between 1949-50 and 1953-54. In the former year, 55 per cent of the reporting schools offered courses wholly devoted to the study of discussion, and 66.8 per cent offered courses in which the subject was studied, though not necessarily as the exclusive concern of the course. By contrast, the data summarized in Table II show that 62 per cent of the schools covered in the second investigation offered at least one course devoted entirely to discussion. More than half of all responding institutions, in each enrollment class, had such an offering. Even though our sample probably reflects the programs of the institutions most interested in Speech education and discussion particularly, it seems fair to conclude that discussion has received increased recognition as an independent study. This inference is also confirmed by the evidence that enrollments in basic and advanced discussion courses grew during the period between surveys. The average enrollment in

TABLE II

TYPES OF COURSES IN DISCUSSION

	No. and Per Cent of Schools Offering Courses									
	Class I		Class II		Class III		Class IV		Total	
Type of Course	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Beginning course	43	55	29	51	25	64	55	78	151	62
Advanced course	5	9	7	12	7	18	26	37	45	19
Discussion and group leadership	6	8	6	10	7	18	15	21	34	13.9
Graduate seminar	1	1	4	7	2	5	15	21	22	9
Other	6	8	1	2	4	10	7	10	18	7
None offered	20	26	17	30	8	20	7	10	52	20

basic courses, for example, was reported at 17.5 in 1949-50 and at 25 in 1953-54.

But the growth of independent courses in discussion has not meant that the subject is no longer studied elsewhere. Our 1953-54 survey indicates that 172 (72%) of all reporting schools treated discussion in combination with other subject matter in courses entitled Public Speaking, Fundamentals of Speech, Parliamentary Law, and the like. Our data do not reveal the precise extent to which these inclusions with other materials represent *additional* attention to the subject, but they do indicate that in nearly half of the reporting institutions discussion had both an incidental and an independent place in the curriculum.

One might suppose that when discussion is taught in combination with other subject matter it would be most often coupled with debate or argument. This seems not to be the case, however; approximately 45 per cent of our 1953-54 respondents taught discussion as part of Fundamentals of Speech courses, but only 33 per cent taught the subject in combination with debate. Moreover, discussion-debate combinations were outnumbered by discussion-fundamentals combinations in every enrollment grouping used in our study. When data from 1949-50 are compared with those from 1953-54, it appears that discussion-debate courses declined in number in the interval between surveys. Altogether, it seems quite likely (though we lack evidence on the point) that as discussion has won recognition in its own right, a number of colleges and universities have simply separated their once combined discussion-debate offerings.

It is not departments of Speech alone that have increased and intensified their discussion programs. Table III indicates the extent to which departments other than Speech departments offered courses in discussion and allied subjects during 1953-54. In type, the courses reported here range through

TABLE III

COURSES IN DISCUSSION AND LEADERSHIP OFFERED IN OTHER DEPARTMENTS

Enrollment Class	Schools Reporting Such Courses Number	Per Cent
Class I	9	12
Class II	4	7
Class III	8	26
Class IV	18	24
Total	39	16*

*Percentage of all schools reporting.

basic instruction in group discussion and conference leadership, psychology of leadership, discussion in personnel management, group dynamics, psychology of group functioning, the social group, small-group interaction, group development, group processes, panel discussion techniques, motivation, public discussion, and social foundations of discussion. In most cases the emphasis in the actual teaching of these courses does not appear to be directly upon the problems of oral communication but rather upon problems of special interest in the discipline sponsoring the instruction. The seven disciplines offering courses in discussion in two or more reporting institutions are: education (15), psychology and social psychology (11), business administration and commerce (7), sociology (4), English (4), social work (3), and social science (2). Whether offerings of this sort have increased in recent years we have not determined since this was not a subject of inquiry in 1949-50. It is evident, however, that the importance of discussion as a subject for academic study and practice is well recognized outside our own field. Altogether, 54 departments other than Speech depart-

ments, in 39 (22%) of our reporting institutions with active Speech programs, were offering discussion courses in 1953-54.

It is the character of courses sponsored by Speech departments that holds greatest interest for our own discipline. The content of these courses was surveyed in 1949-50 and again in our more recent investigation, and the results are presented in Table IV. Basic courses seem to have changed during the years between investigations. Some apparent changes may, of course, be due to sampling differences, but a majority of the schools surveyed in 1953-54 were also surveyed in the earlier inquiry. We believe, therefore, that the increased emphasis on problem solving, formal logic, preparation, speech skills, and participation probably do represent actual course revisions. Our 1953-54 data on the content of advanced courses suggest that some of the shifts of emphasis reflected in Table IV may have come about as advanced courses were introduced. It seems reasonable to suppose, for example, that the decline of interest (in basic courses) in the psychology of groups is at least partially explained by the fact that 48 of the 67 schools offering advanced courses treat the psychology of groups at that level of instruction. However, the same reasoning will not explain the reduced interest in parliamentary procedure in the introductory courses. Only about one-third of the advanced courses treat this topic.

TABLE IV

COMPARISON OF TOPICS TREATED IN BASIC COURSES IN DISCUSSION

Topic	Per Cent of Reporting Schools Including This Subject Matter 1949-50	1953-54
History of Discussion	27	24
Nature of Discussion	*	91
Problem Solving	72	85
Formal Logic	33	63
Evidence	*	83
Preparation	86	92
Participation	72**	94
Leadership	77	77
Resolving Conflict	*	58
Speech Skills	66	78
Types of Public Discussion	79	75
Types of Informal Discussion	*	67
Psychology of Groups	49	21
Role Playing	*	9
Parliamentary Procedure	47	33
Evaluation of Discussion	63	65
Research	*	15

*Not included in 1949-50 survey.
**Called "Member Skills" in 1949-50 survey.

Whatever the explanations for apparent changes in the first discussion courses, it is quite clear that as of 1953-54 they were predominantly programs of instruction in the nature of informal deliberative processes, the management of ideas within these processes, and the development of personal and interpersonal skills essential in making ideas negotiable in informal discussion. Our evidence further suggests that advanced courses differed from beginning courses chiefly in their greater concentration on

problems of leadership, group psychology, and research and research methods.

Recorded class discussions, group self-evaluation, and content criticism are instructional procedures used in basic and advanced courses in more than half the reporting schools. By way of contrast, role playing, use of process observers and feedback, buzz sessions, and introduction of outside consultants were being used in one-fourth or fewer of the basic and advanced courses reported in 1953-54.

Off-campus teaching does not follow closely the pattern of instruction in on-campus discussion courses for largely self-evident reasons. Only 13 of 78 extension courses reported in 1953-54 were the same as courses offered on campus; 21 courses were "mostly different" or "entirely different." The remaining extension courses reported were based on syllabuses prepared for regular academic sessions but adapted in varying degrees to meet the special needs and interests of extension course "customers." Of the 243 schools replying to our 1953-54 survey, 58 (24%) offered one or more extension courses in discussion.

By no means all the extension work in discussion and allied areas falls under the direction of departments of Speech, but Table V shows that staff members of Speech departments participate in such programs at nearly one-fifth of the institutions surveyed. It is also of more than passing interest to observe that labor groups and professional organizations received markedly less attention from reporting Speech departments and staff members than did educational and industrial groups. Perhaps industry's mounting interest in communications and human relations may account for our colleague's greater service to industrial groups. We suggest, however, that the relatively infrequent contact between labor and professional groups and discussion specialists affiliated with departments of Speech is, in itself, a subject worthy of further investigation.

One of the major purposes of the 1953-54 survey was to secure information on the nature, extent, and possible future course of research in discussion. It is not surprising to learn that most of this research is carried on at the larger universities, but it is somewhat unusual that more recently completed or progressing research is being conducted by faculty members than by graduate students. It is also striking to discover no

TABLE V

EXTENSION ACTIVITY BY DEPARTMENTS AND/OR INDIVIDUALS

Type of Activity	Class I		Class II		Class III		Class IV		Total	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%*
Direct & plan workshops	4	5	10	17	10	26	21	30	45	18.5
Organize community discussions	7	9	7	12	10	26	12	17	40	16
Organize or teach business training programs	6	8	2	3	6	15	28	40	43	18
Consultation to:										
Labor groups	1	1	3	5	2	5	14	20	21	9
Industry	4	5	5	9	6	15	26	36	41	17
Community groups	5	6	6	10	8	20	15	21	35	14
Religious groups	9	12	5	9	6	15	13	19	34	14
Professional groups	1	1	3	5	3	8	15	21	23	9
Educational groups	7	9	7	12	9	23	23	33	46	19

*Percentages based on total number of schools reporting.

research recently completed or in progress at any reporting Class II (1,000-1,999) institution and no graduate research at any Class III (2,000-3,999) school. On the other hand, four institutions with enrollments below 1,000 reported research projects recently completed or in progress.

The variety of subjects under investigation at the 23 schools reporting research activity is suggested by the following items from the catalogue of research topics reported in 1953-54: leadership training for decision-making groups, effects of pre-discussion sets upon group productivity and co-operation, social acceptance and rejection in relation to participation, group therapy principles and the teaching of discussion, rhetorical causes of breakdown in discussion, intra-individual differences in leaderless discussion, evaluation of discussion performance, theories of reasoning and their relation to discussion, the American Lyceum, discussion and debate *vs.* reporting and exposition as means of communicating factual material, community and school programs using discussion as a mode of communication and problem solving.

The 23 colleges and universities reporting these and other investigations constitute 9.8 per cent of all schools reporting in 1953-54; this compares with 7.7 per cent affirmative replies received in 1949-50. Evidently, then, there has been a slight increase in the number of institutions at which research in discussion takes place; we have not explored the changes that may have taken place in the character of research in discussion.

Partly because research in discussion is concentrated at a relatively few institutions and because it is always desirable to know what new knowledge is most needed in any field, each respondent to our surveys was asked to indicate the problems he felt should be intensively studied during the next few years. Table VI shows the seven most frequently identified areas of research. Research which aims at developing and testing methods of teaching discussion is the kind of inquiry desired by the largest number of our respondents. Why those who reported for institutions with enrollments between 1,000 and 1,999 should be markedly less enthusiastic about research of this sort is difficult to understand, but their judgment is rather sharply at odds with the views of respondents from larger and smaller schools.

TABLE VI

PROBLEMS DESERVING FUTURE RESEARCH

	Number and Percentage of Respondents Identifying									
	Class I		Class II		Class III		Class IV		Total	
Problem Areas	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Techniques of teaching discussion	40	52	23	40	25	64	44	63	132	54
Psychology of group processes	27	35	32	56	17	43	44	63	120	49
Nature and process of problem solving	27	35	29	51	21	54	35	50	112	46
Techniques of participation	28	36	26	46	16	41	35	50	105	43
Techniques of communication in discussion	25	32	24	42	13	33	39	55	101	42
Techniques of leadership	21	27	22	38	17	43	36	51	96	40
History and development of discussion	5	6	4	7	4	10	8	11	21	9
Other	12	15	11	19	4	10	28	39	58	24

Respondents from each class of institution believe future research should also concentrate on exploring the psychological and methodological aspects of discussion as a process, rather than on its historical development as a form of communication. Compared with our 1949-50 findings, where 11.5 per cent of those replying urged research in the historical development of discussion, these more recent data suggest a waning interest in this kind of investigation. The sense of need for new knowledge about the nature and process of group problem solving seems to have grown in the interval between surveys. This area was identified as important for research by 41.3 per cent of the 1949-50 respondents; whereas 46 per cent thought it important in 1953-54.[2] In sum, those who replied to our second inquiry appear to have said to the research scholar, "Search out better ways of teaching what we already know about discussion and explore the psychological and procedural processes more deeply that we may increase our understanding of this form of deliberation."

By way of concluding this report, we suggest that a rather striking consistency runs through the responses elicited by our Committee's surveys. Academic instruction in discussion has experienced growth in numbers of courses offered and in the intensiveness with which discussional processes are studied. Considerations incidental or peripheral to the practice of discussion-as-process (parliamentary procedure, history of public discourse, debate, descriptive and theoretical psychology, and the like) seem to occupy a diminished place in the content of first courses. A process-skill orientation with emphasis on participation seems to characterize these introductory offerings while advanced courses focus on theoretical and specialized considerations such as the psychology of groups, leadership, and research. In the light of such tendencies in the institutions surveyed, it is quite natural that there should be a concomitant demand for rigorously tested methods by which the principles of discussion may be taught, the content of discourse maintained at a high level, and individual skills in deliberation enhanced. And because it is "process" that distinguishes discussion from other modes of social influence through speech, it is equally natural that teachers of the subject should place their need for more accurate and reliable psychological and procedural descriptions of that process second only to their need to teach better the methods of participation and leadership already known.

The place of discussion has been clearly established in the curricula of colleges and universities having well developed Speech programs. The *objectives* of at least the beginning courses appear to be, on the whole, as clear and as stable as those prevailing in, let us say, public speaking, oral reading, or acting. We do not find, however, a stable and uniform *content* in even the introductory discussion courses. In all probability we must expect course content to vary considerably in balance and in emphasis until our incomplete knowledge and understanding of the nature of informal deliberation is enlarged by further speculation and experimentation.

[2] It is worthy of special notice that *both* "psychology of group processes" and "nature and process of problem solving" ranked high in importance in the 1953-54 survey despite the fact that the questionnaire allowed respondents to discriminate between these items as topics of research. In 1949-50, the *single* item "problem solving" was provided in the questionnaire; nevertheless, it seemed important to a smaller percentage of respondents than either of the options offered in 1953-54.

AESTHETICS AND STAGE DESIGN

Willard F. Bellman

A STAGE designer is an artist who designs lighting and scenery. Although these two aspects of his function are often separated, we shall consider them together for reasons that will soon become apparent. As an artist, the designer deals in the nondiscursive; i.e., his images and symbols defy ordinary logical analysis. Yet it is the purpose of aesthetics to understand his artistic efforts. If that understanding is successful, there is the possibility that it may make the designer's job easier and the teaching of new designers more possible. With this in mind, I propose to sketch the various steps which the designer's work follows, beginning with his first contact with the play and continuing through the completion of his design. I will be particularly concerned with the designer's work as related to himself and to the rest of the production staff. The latter relation is a larger problem than is sometimes supposed because it involves the limits of the designer's artistic endeavors.

One term will need definition: *symbol*. The word will be used here in its widest sense, as linguists and aestheticians use it. It must not be confused with its narrower application to a "school" of theatre design. When it can be said that "this thing stands for these abstract ideas," the thing is a symbol. Some aestheticians and semanticists seem to feel that almost all human thought depends on symbolic devices. Also, a whole galaxy of symbolic materials may stand together for an abstraction of considerable complexity. Indeed, this is the very essence of artistic communication.

The designer's artistic goal is the same as that of all other arts: *communication*. Artistic communication is no telephone-line affair; instead, it involves the active re-creation of the artistic content by all parties involved. There is no such thing as the mechanical relaying of artistic material. In the theatre, this means that all of the interpretive artists—designer, director, actor, etc.—are active parts of the process of re-creation. Their goal must be to re-create the dramatic content with an intensity matching that of the author as he created it.

The supreme artist in the theatre is the director. He is responsible for the synthesis of all parts of the production into an organic whole. All other artists must defer to his judgment. However, deference is hardly the staple of artistic co-operation and productivity. Consequently the successful director is the one who can achieve synthesis by inspiration instead of fiat. This is important to my discussion because it indicates both the wide range and the limits of the designer's work: he works under the artistic direction and inspiration of the director, but, within broad limits, he is a free artist, beholden to the director only in terms of results, not methods.

With this general understanding of the designer's relationship to the rest of the production staff, let us follow him through his various artistic tasks to see the aesthetic implications thereof. The very first reading of the script brings us to the problem of establishing goals.

Willard F. Bellman (Ph.D., Northwestern, 1949) is Assistant Professor of Theatre Arts at the University of California at Los Angeles.

The designer's work is communicative, but communicative of WHAT? The director, the designer, and the rest of the production staff are all at this point engaged in suggesting possibilities. Catch phrases like these may develop and become central to conversation about the play:

Hamlet was a man born two centuries too soon.

Oedipus Rex is a play about a man's attempt to know himself.

Macbeth is a play about crime and its effect on the criminals.

Sin and expiation are the theme of Aeschylus' trilogy.

These are "shorthand" attempts at establishing production goals for each of these plays. They are oversimplified phrases standing for nebulous feelings on the part of the staff members that *this* play must do *these things* in *this production*. They are suggestive only because of two things: 1) the ideas are still hazy in the minds of the artists—only further effort will clarify them; 2) since these phrases deal with dramatic content, or what Appia called "inner drama," they are necessarily vague and general. One of the qualities of artistic content is that it is, by definition, nondiscursive. Its only adequate expression is the art work itself But when these phrases begin to be used about it, that work is a-borning

Vague and nondiscursive or not, the necessity for a goal is overpowering. Nothing can be done until a goal exists. It may come by directorial fiat or through the considered artistic judgment of all parties, but there must be a goal. It may turn out to be impossible or wrong, and it cannot guarantee success, but its absence will guarantee failure.

Since directorial fiat is usually unsuccessful, we must presume that the designer will have a part in the formulation of the goal. What must he do and how? His first obligation is to read the play just like any other newcomer to the script. He must try to read it so as to form a fresh impression; this impression will become an essential part of his experience as he digs into the play later. Next he must study the script and find emotional common ground with it much as an actor must study his part. The goal of this effort is to make the whole thing as emotionally intense to him as if he had written it himself. This takes time, and imagination, and that rare sort of integrity that comes from being able to feel another man's work as deeply as one's own without confusing it with one's own. The designer's emotional reaction to the script at this point is vital; without it he cannot claim to feel and understand the play, nor will he have any criteria by which to judge his subsequent work.

From the beginning, the designer will face the same problem as the other members of the staff: inability to verbalize adequately about the play. Indeed, if dramatic content is as nondiscursive as Appia implied, a measure of successful assimilation may be that the designer will be unable to talk intelligibly about it. This is one time when "if you can't say it, you *do* understand it!" But there is an important qualification: the designer will be progressively more able to express it, or parts of it, as stage design. Visualization will replace verbalization.

If the designer is thinking in terms of the potentialities of modern theatre, and not those of the art of painting, sculpture, or the like, his first visualizations will probably be in terms of space itself—of rhythmic, fluctuating space. He will be concerned with the space actually seen by the audience and, at the

same time, with the space suggested to them, i.e., with the space that seems to surround the action at each moment. Motion in this space and rhythmic changes in its apparent size may be part of his first visualizations. To him it will seem a "big" play or a "little" play in terms of space. Its movements, its variations in size of space, will be smooth or jerky. Its relationship to the suggested space around it will be definite or vague. Here again we find ourselves dealing with "catch words" as a substitute for things that cannot be verbalized.

These visions of space are the designer's first goal, or rather they are his first potentially communicable expression of the goal which the inner drama represents to him. He may be able to communicate that goal to others by a combination of language, sketches, models, and gestures. If so, they will become a part of his contribution to the general task of setting goals.

Now comes the time for images and symbol-making. The designer usually does two things at once. He *creates* images and *judges* them. We must treat these two things sequentially if we are to make sense out of the process.

First: why and how does the designer create these symbolic images? His feelings about the spatial modulations of the play probably have psychological connections to his emotional reaction to the script. Indeed, these spatial "thoughts" about a play have an almost physical reality about them which will demand expression. (Upon this point psychological research is badly needed and almost completely lacking.) Out of his vague physical sensations, his emotional reactions, and his intellectual understanding of the script, the designer must create symbolic images of the play. This is neither a mechanical nor a continuous process. It is usually interrupted not only by other matters, but also by periods of blank mind or of worthless ideas. To the beginner who "just can't get an idea," we must say, "Go back to the play; think, feel and study, find common ground with it, and let the emotions do their work as well as the intellect."

What makes the images which the designer creates? Appia says that this phenomenon is dreamlike. The designer's mind is temporarily relieved of the usual logic and necessities of life. Contradiction and anachronism no longer exist. The physically impossible may become the very symbolic device needed. Relieved of the usual necessities of life, the mind is free to develop new relationships between ideas, to create or discover design where the logical mind finds only chaos.[1]

It appears that Appia was on the right track. Psychology has shown the remarkable tendency of the human mind to organize random patterns into groups and to replace abstractions with symbols. Much research remains to be done before the details of the artist's image-making process will be complete, but it seems possible to make some generalizations.

It appears that the human mind is as abhorrent of an abstraction as nature is of a vacuum. Abstractions, to be endured for any length of time, must be symbolized and condensed into patterns "visible" in the mind's eye, at least. If convenient or if necessary, the mind will try to make these symbols compatible with experience as we find it. However, if the abstraction requires it, and if the

[1] Adolphe Appia, *La Musique et la Mise en Scène*, partially published in an inferior German translation by Princess Cantacuzéné as *Die Musik und die Inscenierung* (Munich: Bruckmann, 1899). The above material is summarized from Part One of the original French manuscript as it exists in a microfilm copy owned by the New York Public Library. No English translation has been published.

mind is allowed to function freely, it will not limit itself to symbols which are "reasonable" in the physical world. Indeed, it may seize upon the most palpable nonsense to express abstract and otherwise unexpressible ideas. (For example, Peer Gynt's troll is arrant nonsense in the logic of the physical world; yet it expresses more completely and emphatically what Ibsen has to say than any other device.)

The symbol-making facility exists in all of us to some degree. Often it is repressed by our desire and need to conform to the logic of the physical world. However, the artist is aware that many ideas will be beyond the range of symbolization if all symbols must agree with the physical world. In fact, such a restriction would eliminate most of the very material that the artist feels compelled to symbolize.

The scenic designer's abstractions are those of the inner drama; the raw material for his symbols is anything which his experience tells him might be effective in the theatre. He, like all other artists, feels the necessity to be relieved of the logic of the physical world. This logic is a function of the conscious mind which must operate in the physical world in order to survive. Hence the conscious mind is limited as a symbol-making device for the artist. It is in the subconscious—the home of the dreams—that the artist's symbol-making seems to take place. The conscious mind is the supplier of both abstract ideas and the stock for symbol-making. It is valid to say that the designer "dreams up" his images, but it does not follow that there is no hard effort involved. The phrase merely conceals the fact that no amount of hard labor will produce an art work, either in or out of the theatre; art takes both hard effort and an active imagination. The images seem to come from the subconscious mind of the designer working under the stimulus of the abstract inner drama. If the designer wishes to think about the inner drama, he is almost compelled to create some sort of symbols to do it. His mind will create them for him if he will but let it and recognize them when they are created. He must develop the ability to let symbols come to him even though his conscious mind rebels at first at their illogical nature. It is only when he abandons the logic of the physical world as a criterion for his symbols that he will begin to be able to deal with inner drama adequately. Note that I have *not* said that symbols are unrelated to or unintelligible in the physical world. Thus I am not advocating a retreat into chaos or obscurantism, but only a recognition that symbols must be judged less by logic than by artistic adequacy.

Now we come to the second half of the designer's problem: how does he judge his symbol-images? The question arises: will the symbols "dreamed up" by the designer be of any value on the stage? First, will they have any meaning to anyone but him? Will they do an adequate job? And can they be staged? The first two questions are hard to answer, but will be the subject of discussion to follow. The third is a technical question and beyond the scope of this paper.

The first two questions are hard to answer because the criteria for judging the symbols are difficult to apply. At the time of creation the images exist only in the mind of the artist or as sketches and models practically meaningless to all but him. They have been created out of his emotions, and he does not feel objective about them. Moreover, their success depends upon whether or not they can arouse the same sort of reaction in the audience that accompanied their crea-

tion. At the time of creation, the designer is most poorly equipped to judge this complicated matter if any degree of objectivity is needed. He can and should, if possible, defer judgment until a later moment, but sooner or later he will have to decide whether or not his image "is" the idea. A form of the verb "to be" is used to describe his decision because many designers insist that there is a sort of identity established between successful expression (symbolization) and the abstract idea expressed. Emotionally, at least, expression and idea become identical. This is all that the designer has to go on; his judgment is therefore limited and often faulty. The test of a good designer is usually not his ability to "get" ideas, but rather his ability to tell good ones from bad ones.

At this point we must cease thinking of the designer only in relation to himself and consider his relation to the whole production. Scene design and lighting are limited arts in the theatre. They cannot expect to do everything by themselves. Thus the designer is not like the poet; he does not take the entire praise or blame for his efforts. The scene designer is a part of a group effort, and his reward is limited by the relation between his art and the whole of the finished production. Your poet has no trouble with a mixed verdict concerning the value of one of his symbols. Either it does the job he wants it to do at that point or he gets a symbol that will. Not so with the scene designer. A mixed verdict may mean several things to him; his symbol may be bad, he may be expecting it to do more than it should, or it may even be doing too much! The latter condition is, in many ways, the greatest danger of all. Therefore one must ask, what is the proper role of the designer in a theatrical production?

We may begin by recalling Appia's statement that the only independent artist in the theatre is the actor. Appia insists that the only artist who would still be intelligible if all others were removed is the actor. There would still be theatre, however lacking it might be in impressiveness.

Since we have been treating the art of the theatre as a symbolic process, and since Appia's statement is not open to serious question, it may be well to consider the relative symbolic merits of the actor and of the designer. This investigation will lead to hair-splitting, however, if we let it result in a catalogue of the various possible symbolic fortes of these two artists. Instead, we must consider how they work together in *one* symbolic production. If the designer ignores the synthesis of efforts and attempts to make his work stand alone, he falls into the trap that engulfed the "symbolism school" of theatre production. If he does not ignore these efforts, he will find that one of his most important and useful criteria for judging his symbols will be that of the degree to which they allow a fusion of set and of actor movement into one symbolic expression of the inner drama.

This criterion may seem more applicable to the abstract sort of setting where the designer literally designs the acting surface in three dimensions than to the run-of-the-mill realistic play where the arrangement of setting walls and furniture will determine the extent and quality of movement for the actors, and where also the color of the background and the arrangement of the lighting will largely determine the emphatic value and relative importance of the actor's movement. In a theatre which seems to be moving away from realism, this question may be academic. The designer in the nonrealistic theatre

can assume as much control over actor-movement as he wishes.

This is not an unmixed blessing. With a greater share in the designer-actor combination, the designer must also take greater responsibility for the results. He may be free to design within the general artistic terms set forth by the director, but he is artistically obligated to work with the director at every stage of design from the first nebulous attempt at space-relationship to the final result. Only when the designer and director see the movement of the play in the same terms will their work have the best chance to succeed. Moreover, it is the designer's duty to make clear to the director the various potential movements, both good and bad, which his proposed set provides. He should make preliminary models available to the director early enough so that the latter may try various schemes of blocking and may then accept or reject the design before he is faced with the necessity of blocking the play. Of course, the director is also obligated to make an effort to see the play in terms of three-dimensional movement in space rather than two-dimensional movement of actors over the stage floor. The potentialities of the play may only be realized if both designer and director see the visual production as a rhythmically changing expression in space.

We have provided the designer with one specific criterion for judging his images: his sense that the image "is" the inner drama, that it symbolizes the inner drama emotionally and intellectually within the limits of his responsibility as an artist in a combined effort. He must not expect his work to stand alone artistically but to fuse with that of the actor in one symbolic effort. His set should be incomplete and his lighting vague until the actor adds definiteness and specificity to both.

Probably the designer's greatest danger is that he may attempt to do too much. It is easy to underestimate the clarifying and fulfilling power of the actor. Often the vaguest and most general "mood" in setting and lighting will take on specific and powerful symbolic values when brought into contact with the actor and his ability to use language and movement. For example, a roaring tempest on stage induced by moving projections and weird platforms may seem appropriate to the storm scene in *King Lear*. Yet the actor may be lost amid the effects, and the expression may be lost in the very attempt to present it. The important tempest in that scene is in Lear's mind and emotions; it is merely echoed by the raging elements. Therefore a vague and stationary projection and lighting that will enable Lear to move over a setting calculated to promote erratic movement and violent changes in position may enable the actor to do what no amount of tempest or hurricane will symbolize. It is more important that we see within Lear's tempest than that we experience nature's. Other examples could be cited almost endlessly to show that modern stage design is all too often guilty of staging the play right off the stage.

Once the designer has evaluated his images, has chosen those that meet the above criteria, and has made them concrete in the form of models, sketches, and plans, his work is finished. He has had a hand in the establishing of goals for the production as he works with the director and envisions the play in terms of space and movement; and he has had a large share in creating an expression in space and time that is capable of communicating some of the most complex ideas and emotions which the human mind is capable of creating.

ENGLISH IN GREECE

James W. Abel

FROM 1931 to 1934, and again in 1954-55, I had the good fortune to teach English as a foreign language in Greece. When I returned on the second occasion, after an absence of twenty years, I was struck by one change: the teaching and study of English in that country had greatly increased. In Thessaloniki, where I lived both times I was in Greece, there were two schools in which English was taught in 1934; in 1955, there were at least eight. In 1934, there could not have been over 300 or 400 studying English in these schools; in 1954-55, there were no fewer than 5,000 enrolled in some kind of English class. In other words, English students in a period of two decades had increased ten times in a city whose population had increased only two times. In the public schools in Greece no English was taught in 1934. Today, it is the required foreign language of the gymnasia. Neither of the two Greek universities taught English twenty years ago; today, both are training teachers for gymnasia classes.

For a number of reasons my present discussion of English instruction in Greece is not exhaustive. First, elementary schools, classes offered by organizations like the YMCA and YWCA, and the extensive work of private teachers are largely omitted from consideration. Secondly, precise figures on this matter are often not available. Thirdly, my discussion deals more with Thessaloniki than with the much larger city and capital, Athens, or with other parts of the country.

James W. Abel (Ph.D., Louisiana State University, 1949) is an Instructor in the Department of Speech, Brooklyn College.

The extent of English instruction in Greece includes not merely the number of schools in which instruction is offered but also the scope of the work done in those schools. I shall endeavor here to describe the scope of the work done in five distinct academic settings in Greece.

The first academic setting consists of the so-called American schools. The word "American" does not mean that the schools are operated by the American government. It means instead that these schools grew either directly or indirectly out of American missionary work. At present, however, Pierce College is the only one of these schools that is controlled by a mission board. The others have become independent corporations, like many of our church schools in the United States. In each American school in Greece the chief administrator is American, as are some of the teachers. With the exception of the Thessalonica Agricultural and Industrial Institute, familiarly known as the Farm School, pupils pay tuition in these centers of instruction. With the same exception, all the American schools provide at least a gymnasium education and have an official status as gymnasia with the Greek Ministry of Education. The Farm School, however, provides four years of agricultural and related industrial training to 150 carefully selected farm boys. The academic program of this school includes a working knowledge of English; all other American schools have a more extensive English program.

Another American school in Thessaloniki is Anatolia College, where I taught during my two sojourns in Greece. It consists of a boys' school of about 300 and a girls' school of approximately the same size. The total program covers seven years, whereas a public gymnasium covers six. The extra year in Anatolia College is known as the Preparatory Class, and it allows for concentrated work in English. Boys and girls who can pass an English proficiency examination may skip this preparatory year and enter directly into the First Form. In the fall of 1954, about half of the First Form boys entered by examination. This indicates the teaching of English in a limited number of private elementary schools and also means that there were twelve-year-old boys who had had sufficient private tutoring to provide them with a speaking, reading, and writing knowledge of elementary English.

Pupils study English throughout the six or seven years of their stay in Anatolia College. In the main, their courses aim at developing skill in use of this language, not at developing knowledge about the language or its literature. The Preparatory Class has fifteen hours of English per week. At this level, the paramount goal is oral skill and comprehension. This continues to be the goal in the First Form, where the English course occupies sometimes nine and sometimes ten hours. The textbooks used during the first two years are the four making up the Fries American English Series.[1] The amount of time devoted to English is progressively reduced to five hours by the seventh and last year, and progressively more attention is paid to reading and writing. The last two years are largely given over to an elementary introduction to American and English literature and to composition. Also, since many of the graduates will need to know how to translate from Greek to English and vice versa, courses in this aspect of language study are begun as early as the Fourth Form.

Outside the English classroom, pupils are encouraged to speak English among themselves and with their English speaking teachers. Psychology, sociology, hygiene, some sciences, and music are taught in English. As for extracurricular activities, the chorus sings in English, once a year the girls give a play in English, most of the pupils hear two or three short English speeches each week in chapel, and to some extent the required games program is "in English," particularly when an American is in charge. Inevitably there is often an amusing mixture of Greek and English, especially in the playing of baseball.

In Athens, the American schools are Athens College for boys and Pierce College for girls. In addition to the gymnasium, Athens College has the last three years of elementary school, and in each of them English is taught five periods per week.[2] In 1955, 368 boys were in these classes, whereas in the gymnasium there were 600. First-year boys took a ten-hour course in English; second-year and third-year boys, a five-hour course; and all others, a three-hour course. More content courses were taught in English than at Anatolia College.

The 500 girls in the gymnasium of Pierce College have English a few more hours than do the boys at Athens College but a few less than do pupils at

[1] Pauline M. Rojas and staff, *Fries American English Series for the Study of English as a Second Language* (Boston, 1952).

[2] I am particularly indebted to Mr. Elias N. Eliascos, Assistant Principal, for information about Athens College.

Anatolia.[3] The fundamental philosophy is the same in all three, and it emphasizes training in language skill. This training is intensified at Pierce in an eighth year devoted almost entirely to advanced work in English. In 1954-55 this work involved three hours of English composition and three hours of literature in addition to the same number of hours of sociology, of ethics, of psychology, of Speech, of European history, of world culture, of typing, and of gymnastics, all of which were taught in English. There were thirty-four students in these courses. Fourteen others received even more intensive training in a special English tutorial class. In addition, Pierce offered two-year professional programs in commercial studies and social welfare, both taught in English except for some lectures by Greek professional men about social welfare problems and organizations in Greece. In round numbers, fifty students were following these programs during my recent year there.

As I have said, the American schools have no government connections; but training in English under government sponsorship is given as a part of the program of the United States Information Service, which is the second of the five academic settings in which English is taught in Greece. In 1954-55, USIS organized twelve classes for professors and high officials of the Greek government. Some classes were conducted in Athens, some in Thessaloniki, for students who pay no fees. About 165 students enrolled, and there were as many others who could not be accommodated.[4] These classes were for beginners and advanced beginners; they were continued into 1955-56 and to them, I believe, has been added what is described as top-level translation.

In 1953, USIS began to administer the Examination for the Certificate of Proficiency in English prepared by the English Language Institute of the University of Michigan. Commonly called the Michigan examination, it is open to all who wish to take it, and as of April, 1955, 700 had done so. The reason for taking the examination is to obtain the certificate, which can be a vocational asset, as can similar certificates from other sources.

Certification is a distinctive interest of the third academic setting in which English courses are offered in Greece. This setting consists of schools which I call institutes. They share four characteristics. Their prime function is the teaching of English to a part-time student body. They charge tuition, and they either offer certificates in recognition of advanced competence or prepare their students for certificate examinations, usually those administered by the British Institute.

Though the British Institute is the prototype of this group, it is different from the others in that it is an activity of the British Council, which in turn is connected with the British government. As explained to me by Mr. Frank Turner, Director of the British Institute in Thessaloniki,[5] the British Council is a branch of the British Foreign Office but is essentially autonomous. Its purpose is to bring the British way of life to foreigners by various means, one being the Institute, and another, the granting of scholarships

[3] Much of my information about Pierce College comes from its catalogue and from a letter by Miss Catherene Papadopoulou, Chairman of the English Department.

[4] I am especially indebted to Dr. Annis Sandvos, United States Acting Cultural Attaché, who not only provided me with information about the USIS classes but was my sole personal source of information about the program in the Greek gymnasia.

[5] Mr. Turner supplied all the information I have about the British Council and Institute.

to foreigners for study in England. None of the other institutes has any governmental connection.

In the fall of 1954-55, the British Institute in Thessaloniki enrolled about 1,000 students; in the spring, about 800. Its counterpart in Athens, known as the Institute of English Studies, had in the neighborhood of 2,000.

The program of the Institute in Thessaloniki can be divided conveniently into two parts. The first and introductory part consists of four years of work. At this level classes meet for an hour three times per week. Here, as in the other institutes, there is no obligation to finish the course, and no certificate is given in recognition of successful completion of the first four years. The syllabus provided me suggests that the goals of these four years of work at the British Institute are an essential grounding in grammar, in comprehension, and in composition, with an introduction to translation. The first three years of work appear to be built around *Essential English,* Books I, II, and III, by Charles E. Eckersley, with *Living English Structure* by W. Stannard Allen being introduced during the third year and continued in the fourth. Both of these works are supplemented by prepared reading materials and comprehension exercises.

The second part of the curriculum at the British Institute consists of what are called Cambridge classes, because upon completion of them students are eligible to try for appropriate certificates granted by Cambridge University. The Cambridge classes are in turn divided into two levels. The first level consists of one year of work, four or five times per week. At the end of this year students may try for what is known as a Lower Certificate. The examination covers composition, comprehension, translation, speaking, and dictation. The second level of Cambridge classes is called Proficiency, after the name of the certificate to which it leads. During the two years which make up this level, classes continue to meet four or five times per week. Some idea of what a student studies at this level can be gained from perusal of a Proficiency examination. The major sections cover the following topics and activities: English usage; English life and institutions; English literature, including familiarity with books and literary criticism; comprehension and composition; and translation from Greek to English and vice versa.

Another institute in which English instruction is offered in Greece is the Greek American Cultural Institute. "[It] . . . was established in 1946 by a group of young men belonging to the 'Greek American Youth Association' and some interested Greeks . . . according to Greek laws, its chief aim being a close cultural cooperation with Americans. The Institute conducts classes in English mainly to give Greek youth a practical, working knowledge of the English language, and also to acquaint them more fully with American thought, customs, habits, etc."[6]

There is a comparatively large and detailed amount of statistical information available about the Greek American Institute. This information reveals who studies at this center and how many Greeks pursue English. In 1954, there were thirty Greek-American centers scattered over Greece with a total approxi-

[6] *Record of the Greek American Cultural Institute for the years 1946-50* (Thessaloniki, Greece, Summer 1954), p. 7. This publication was shown me by Mr. S. Papadopoulos, who is in charge of the academic program of the Thessaloniki center of the Institute. Mr. Papadopoulos provided me with much other information and made it possible for me to visit some classes.

mate enrollment of 10,000. In 1955, there were 2,000 in the Thessaloniki center and a larger number in Athens. Out of 2,746 registered in Thessaloniki and Athens in 1950-51, 796 were gymnasium pupils; 558 were university students; 428 were clerks; 622 had no occupation. Approximately eighty-two per cent of the 2,746 students ranged in age from 15 to 25. (These continue to be representative figures.)

The academic organization of the Greek American Institute is much like that of the British Institute, but it is not as fully developed at the upper levels. More use is made of American textbooks, especially from among *Dixson's English Series*,[7] and generally there is more concern with things American. The Institute awards its own lower and higher certificates.

Within the institute group is the school run by the alumni of Anatolia College.[8] It grew out of activity during the German occupation. One of the ways Greeks expressed their rebellion against the occupation was secretly to teach and study English. Now, the graduates of the College want to carry the spirit and some of the activities of the school beyond the confines of the campus, and the language school is one of their projects. In 1954-55, approximately 400 students were enrolled in its five-year program. As in other institutes, the first four years are introductory, and as at the British Institute, the Eckersley series of textbooks is used. The fifth-year class is made up of about 25 of the best from the fourth class. In a general way it aims at preparing for the Lower Certificate examination of the British Institute.

[7] Robert J. Dixson et al., (New York, various dates).

[8] Miss E. Anastasiadou, a senior member of the staff, provided me with details about this school.

Also of the institute type are a number of private schools, often called schools of English. The school of Mrs. S. Vafopoulou in Thessaloniki is a representative example of this variety of institute, because Mrs. Vafopoulou somewhat personifies the study of English by Greeks. She is a graduate of both Anatolia and Pierce College. Later she obtained a degree in England as a British Council Scholar, after having taught at the British Institute. She accepts as students only elementary school graduates, and most of her students are either in attendance at, or are graduates of, a gymnasium. The first five years of her program intends essentially to prepare students for the Cambridge Lower Certificate examination. Beyond this, two additional years prepare for the Proficiency. Since the coming of the Michigan examination, its requirements have been given consideration at the upper levels. In 1955, her school had an enrollment of 500 students.

It has been said already that English is the foreign language required in Greek government gymnasia. The requirement is more of a plan than an actuality, in large part because of lack of qualified teachers. The official program calls for a total of seventeen academic hours of English spread over six years, to be taught after the manner developed by modern linguists. The overall purposes are in essence to enable students to read, write, speak, and understand; to further interest in, and appreciation of, literature in English; and to further understanding and appreciation of British and American culture.

Classes in English began in the spring of 1952 in twenty-three provincial gymnasia. By "provincial" I mean everything outside of Athens, Thessaloniki, and Patras. A considered part of the whole scheme, in fact, was to begin

THE LARYNGECTOMEES ORGANIZE

Warren H. Gardner

NUMEROUS clubs of laryngectomized persons have been formed in the United States and in Canada during the past five years. For three years they have been affiliated in *The International Association of Laryngectomees.* This extensive development in two countries stems from the greatly increased length of survival of many laryngectomized persons. In the early years, when laryngectomy was uncommon, the long-term survival rate was low[1]; but the earlier recognition and detection of cancer of the larynx, the improvement in anesthetic procedures and in surgical techniques, and the use of antibiotics and the modern aspirator have contributed to the longer survival of the laryngectomees.

The laryngectomee is more likely to survive today, but he nevertheless is seriously handicapped socially and economically by the loss of speech. Unless speech rehabilitation is effected promptly, the patient may experience severe mental depression and also may not be able to resume employment. A few patients learn esophageal speech without instruction, but most of them learn it from lay esophageal speakers, from trained speech pathologists, or from both lay persons and specialists. In large metropolitan areas and in university speech clinics there are sufficient numbers of laryngectomees to permit group instruction in speech. In the groups or classes, they associate with similarly handicapped patients who are in various stages of speech development. The group work and association inevitably lead to the exchange of experiences and the formation of recreational and social clubs to help, in part, future laryngectomees overcome their problems. The Lost Chord Clubs have evolved naturally from these groups of patients who have handicaps, interests, and goals in common.

The earliest known organization of laryngectomees was a Lost Chord Club in Brooklyn, which was active in the 1920's.[2] In the early 1930's, Nicholas Ehrlich, who had undergone laryngectomy, taught a class in esophageal speech at the Presbyterian Hospital in New York City. He called himself a laryngectomee at the suggestion of the lexicographer of *The Literary Digest.* Using his class in esophageal speech as a nucleus, he first organized a Lost Chord League in 1930, and then the Lost Speech Alliance in 1933. The sponsor of the Alliance was C. G. Coakley, M.D., Chief of Staff of Otolaryngology at Presbyterian Hospital. Other prominent surgeons collaborated, as did the Social Service Department of the Presbyterian Hospital and of the Manhattan Eye and Ear Hospital. For three years the programs of the Alliance consisted of lectures and discussions by well-known

Warren H. Gardner (Ph.D., University of Iowa, 1936) is a Staff Member in the Audiology and Speech Pathology Section of the Department of Otolaryngology of The Cleveland Clinic Foundation and The Frank E. Bunts Educational Institute; and he is the founder of The International Association of Laryngectomees.

[1] Nicholas Ehrlich, *The Life of a Laryngectomee* (New York, 1937), p. 32.

[2] D. M. Markle, Director, Speech and Hearing Clinic, Presbyterian Hospital, New York New York; personal communication, March 5, 1952.

surgeons and practical demonstrations of esophageal speech.

A decade later, in 1944, formation of the Anamilo Club of New York City was sponsored by James Sonnett Greene, M. D., Director of the National Hospital for Speech Disorders.[3] *Anamilo* is a word that means *we talk again*. The Club was supplied with members by the postlaryngectomy speech group of the Hospital and was used as a source of encouragement for those who were newly laryngectomized. Patients who had voice instruction at the hospital later started a postlaryngectomy class in Detroit in 1948 and a year later organized the Detroit Anamilo Club.

In 1947, The Cleveland Lost Chord Club was formed under the auspices of the Cleveland Hearing and Speech Center, and with the collaboration of Cleveland surgeons. The president of the Club, Mrs. Florence Fross, who was taught esophageal-pharyngeal speech by her surgeon, Dr. Julius W. McCall, St. Luke's Hospital, Cleveland, had been teaching laryngectomized patients at the Center since 1944. Sixteen of her pupils were charter members of The Cleveland Lost Chord Club. The name of the Club appealed to surgeons and laryngectomees in distant cities, who corresponded for information. Additional clubs were organized, and various names were used, such as Lost Chord, New Voice, Laryngectomees, Laryngects, or Lost Vocal Chord.

In 1949, the Montreal Laryngectomy Group and the Chicago Lost Vocal Chord Society were organized. In 1950, the Central Ohio Lost Chord Club was formed at Columbus, Ohio, under the sponsorship of the Department of Speech of The Ohio State University; and the Nu-Voice Club was formed by twelve laryngectomees in St. Louis. In 1951, clubs were formed in Memphis, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Buffalo, Louisville, and Toronto. In 1952, clubs were organized in Birmingham, Alabama, and Nashville, Tennessee; and two statewide groups, the Laryngectomees of Georgia (at Atlanta) and the Laryngectomees of Florida (at Miami). In 1953, clubs were formed in New Orleans, Kent, Ohio, Southern California at Los Angeles, and Milwaukee. A year later the Northern California Lost Chord Club was formed at San Francisco. In 1955, the latest clubs to organize were in Minneapolis, Tampa, Charlotte, North Carolina, and Grand Rapids.

In 1947 the Cured Cancer Club was formed in Boston by patients who had been cured of any type of cancer. The Club's services were broader than those of the laryngectomee groups, in that their members volunteered to visit and to comfort cancer patients before and after hospitalization, to publicize cancer facts, to prepare hospital bandages, and to teach esophageal speech. The Club's present sponsor, also its founder, is Mrs. Paul A. Doehler, a laryngectomee who has been teaching at the Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary since September of 1945.[4]

The lively interest in and exchange of information about methods for organizing clubs and securing teachers and financial support pointed to the desirability of organizing the laryngectomee clubs on a basis of national affiliation. Accordingly, toward this end, in 1952 the staff of the Cleveland Hearing and Speech Center, at its First Institute on Voice Pathology held in Cleveland, sponsored the founding of The Inter-

[3] David Ross, Medical Director, National Hospital for Speech Disorders, New York, New York; personal communication, March 26, 1952.

[4] (Mrs.) P. A. Doehler, President, Cured Cancer Club, Boston, Massachusetts; personal communication, December 9, 1955.

national Association of Laryngectomees.[5] This Institute was financially supported by the American Cancer Society and the National Cancer Institute of the National Institutes of Health. Collaborating with the sponsors were The Cleveland Lost Chord Club, The Academy of Medicine of Cleveland, The Cleveland Otolaryngological Club, The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation (Federal Security Agency), and the School of Medicine and the Department of Speech of Western Reserve University. More than 150 laryngectomees representing 14 clubs, and delegates from chapters of 6 cancer societies, from 12 universities, and from 5 State Rehabilitation Services, attended the scientific sessions. Succeeding conventions were held in Cleveland and in Detroit. In Detroit, a roll call poll indicated an Association membership of 4,000 persons in the various clubs. The latest convention was held in Miami, Florida, in June, 1955, when an ambitious program was planned for the future years.

The American Cancer Society, in recognition of the importance of this group to its own ceaseless campaign against cancer, generously supported each of the conventions of The International Association of Laryngectomees. In June, 1955, the Board of Directors of the Association proposed that the American Cancer Society, together with its many State and local chapters, permanently sponsor the programs of the Association's local clubs and of the Association itself.[6] The proposal was immediately accepted by the American Cancer Society, and National Headquarters with an executive secretary were established at 4811 John R Street, Detroit, Michigan. It is hoped that through the close collaboration of the Association with the American Cancer Society and its local units, no laryngectomee in the United States or in Canada will be deprived of the opportunity to learn esophageal-pharyngeal speech.

The first publication of the Association appeared in October, 1955.[7] The Association's magazine will be sent to all laryngectomees whose names are furnished by surgeons, speech centers, and local chapters of the American Cancer Society. They thereby will be offered the encouraging and inspiring information that is written for their benefit.

[5] *First Institute on Voice Pathology and Proceedings of the First International Meeting of Laryngectomized Persons, Cleveland Hearing and Speech Center* (Cleveland, Ohio, 1952), p. 90.

[6] The International Association of Laryngectomees, Minutes of the Fourth Meeting, (Miami, Florida, 1955).

[7] *I. A. L. News*, I (October, 1955), (International Association of Laryngectomees, 4811 John R Street, Detroit, Michigan).

DELIVERY

Remember the importance of Delivery. Demosthenes, greatest of all orators, is reported to have said when asked what was the chief quality in oratory, Delivery; and when asked what was the second and again what was the third, to have made the same reply. It is related that his own elocution and manner were at first poor, and were improved by incessant study and practice. And though a rich or sweet or sonorous and resonant voice is a gift of nature, care and training can do much to get good results out of a mediocre organ. Articulation, modulation, and expression may all be cultivated. To listen to words clearly and finely spoken, and to sentences in which the voice adapts itself to the subject, adds greatly to whatever pleasure a speech can give.

James Bryce, *University and Historical Addresses* (London, 1913), pp. 292-293.

EDWARD EVERETT: RHETORICIAN OF NATIONALISM, 1824-1855

Ronald F. Reid

I

NINETEENTH-CENTURY American ceremonial oratory, often dismissed lightly as chauvinistic chest-thumping, is significant to historians of public address for its quantity, if nothing else. Beyond mere quantity, however, the Fourth of July oration, the public eulogy, and the commemoration of historical events are important because they both reflected and helped sustain a high degree of American nationalism.

For many years Edward Everett was one of New England's most prolific ceremonial orators.[1] "Since the Address before the Phi Beta Kappa in 1824," wrote one reviewer of Everett's speeches, ". . . there has hardly been any marked occasion or event or man among us that has not been commemorated by Mr. Everett's ample and accomplished rhetoric."[2] Although this admirer may have exaggerated the facts, Everett's oratorical reputation rested in part upon the number and variety of occasions upon which he spoke. "We exceedingly doubt," wrote another reviewer, "whether there is any other man of the age,—certainly there is no one on this side of the water,—whose labours have been put in requisition on such a variety of occasions."[3]

Everett's conviction as to the value of nationalistic ceremonial oratory was strong. He believed that the orator, by speaking on nationalistic themes, could lessen the disunity which resulted from party and sectional strife. In one public statement of this point of view he said:

> It is the natural tendency of celebrating the fourth of July, to strengthen the sentiment of attachment to the Union. It carries us back to other days of yet greater peril to our beloved country, when a still stronger bond of feeling and action united the hearts of her children. It recalls to us the sacrifices of those who deserted all the walks of private industry, and abandoned the prospects of opening life, to engage in the service of their country. It reminds

Ronald F. Reid (Ph.D., Purdue, 1954) is Assistant Professor of Speech at Washington University, St. Louis. This paper is based upon a portion of his doctoral dissertation written under the direction of N. B. Beck.

[1] Everett (1794-1865), after graduating from Harvard, was pastor for about one year of Brattle Square Church in Boston, studied for four and a half years in Europe, and held the Professorship of Greek Language and Literature at Harvard for six years. He then entered politics, serving as Congressman (1825-35), Governor of Massachusetts (1836-39), and Minister to Great Britain (1841-45). He was president of Harvard (1846-49), Secretary of State (1852-53), and United States Senator (1853-54). For biographical details, see Paul Revere Frothingham, *Edward Everett: Orator and Statesman* (Boston, 1925) and *Dictionary of American Biography*, s.v. "Everett, Edward."

Everett's career as a ceremonial orator began in 1824, when he delivered the Harvard Phi Beta Kappa address which Lafayette attended. His post-1855 oratory deserves considerable attention and many of the observations in this paper—especially those relating to Everett's emphasis on nationalism—apply to his later oratory. The terminal date of this essay was chosen because (1) his later speeches were usually delivered from the lecture platform, so that the nature of the occasions differed markedly from those described in this paper, and (2) his Civil War oratory, with the possible exception of his Gettysburg speech and a few other ceremonial addresses, was more "conversational" in style and delivery, comparatively free of digressions, and emphasized closely reasoned lines of argument on the issues of the day rather than indirect applications of history to current questions.

[2] "Review of Current Literature," *Christian Examiner*, LXVII (November 1859), 464.

[3] "Everett's Orations and Speeches," *New Englander*, IX (February 1851), 45.

us of the fortitude of those who took upon themselves the perilous responsibility of leading the public councils in the paths of revolution; in the sure alternative of that success, which was all but desperate, and that scaffold, already menaced as their predestined fate if they failed. It calls up, as it were, from the beds of glory and peace where they lie,—from the heights of Charlestown to the southern plains,—the vast and venerable congregation of those who bled in the sacred cause. They gather in saddened majesty around us, and adjure us, by their returning agonies and re-opening wounds, not to permit our feuds and dissensions to destroy the value of that birthright which they purchased with their precious lives.[4]

Nationalism, then, was at the heart of Everett's ceremonial oratory. The purpose of this paper is 1) to show how nationalism permeated the occasions on which Everett spoke, thereby helping to render his audiences suggestible to his oratory, 2) to show how nationalism pervaded the subject-matter, structure, themes, and development of his speeches, 3) to present evidence concerning the popular response to his oratory, and 4) to discuss some of the more important rhetorical characteristics which explain his effectiveness.

II

New England, ever fond of celebrating anniversaries of historical events, called upon Everett to commemorate such occasions as the landing of the Pilgrims, the landing of Governor Winthrop, the signing of the Declaration of Independence, and a variety of Revolutionary and Indian battles. Equally eager to commemorate its departed heroes, New England commissioned Everett to eulogize such patriots as Adams, Jefferson, and Lafayette.

Many factors within these situations not only helped make Everett's audiences suggestible to patriotic themes, but, in effect, demanded such oratory. Physical nearness to the place of historical events was one factor. For example, in commemorating the Battle of Bloody Brook, the audience gathered "on the very field where the battle was fought."[5]

The physical presence of national heroes also lent a spirit of nationalism to these occasions. In 1824, for example, Lafayette attended Everett's Phi Beta Kappa oration. His presence, reports one of Everett's contemporaries, "spread a festal joy, unexampled in the history of the country, preparing the minds of men to respond to the inspired voices of eloquent speakers,—to beat in full accordance with the thrilling memories of the past,—to swell with the exulting anticipations of the future."[6] In other words, Lafayette's attendance put Cambridge, Massachusetts, into a highly suggestible mood to hear nationalistic sentiments.

To be sure, a hero of Lafayette's stature was not to be found often. But lesser heroes were available. In at least one case, the celebration of the Battle of Lexington on April 20, 1835, survivors of the Revolution sat on the stage behind Everett while he spoke.[7]

Even public mournings were pervaded by an air of nationalism. Note, for example, a contemporary description of Faneuil Hall's decoration for the public mourning of Lafayette:

Faneuil-Hall was beautifully arrayed in *solemn black* for the ceremony. From the centre of the different columns hung festoons of black cloth making a conical roof. The galleries were clothed and the columns entwined with black broadcloth. In front of the galleries, on each side, the national flags of France and the United States, united and festooned with black drapery—and placed immediately before it was a bust of Lafayette, on a high pedestal. The

[4] *Orations and Speeches on Various Occasions*, 8th ed. (Boston, 1870), I, 380-81—hereafter cited in various editions as *Orations*.

[5] *Boston Weekly Messenger*, October 8, 1835, p. 1.

[6] James Spear Loring, *The Hundred Boston Orators* (Boston, 1854), p. 536.

[7] *Boston Courier*, April 22, 1835, p. 2.

Musical Choir was arranged on each side of the Organ. On the centre of the eastern gallery was a large American Eagle, with outspread wings—and in front of the gallery immediately under the Eagle, upon the black cloth, the name of Lafayette, was inscribed in silver characters.[8]

By such means as these were oratorical occasions pervaded by a spirit of nationalism; and to it Everett adapted his speeches.

III

Everett usually turned to history for his subject matter. On the Fourth of July, 1828, for example, he traced the "History of Liberty." On the Fourth of July, 1830, he "thought it appropriate to the occasion to point out, in a summary way, the connection of the growth of our manufactures with the independence of the country. . . ."[9] At Plymouth, on December 22, 1824, he discussed "a few of those circumstances of the first emigration to our country, and particularly of the first emigration to New England. . . ."[10] On the Fourth of July, 1833, he explained "the civil and military education which the country had received" during the Seven Years' War as preparation for the Revolution.[11]

Although Everett's speeches contained considerable historical narrative and some historical criticism, they can not be considered historical essays. Nor can the careful organization which an outline of a given speech usually reveals, his clear enunciation of his central theme, and his sometimes effective use of summaries enable us to consider his orations as expository lectures. On the contrary, his speeches reveal a distinctly rhetorical bent, to which historical exposition and clarity were subordinated. And his extended introductions, his frequent and lengthy digressions, his long illustrations, and his protracted perorations are often devices for stressing nationalistic themes.

One such theme was based upon the premise that God guided the course of history. When commemorating the Battle of Bloody Brook, Everett defended the ancestors who had driven the Indians from their homes, assuring his listeners that "it was obviously the purpose of Providence, that it [the continent of America] should become the abode of civilization, the arts, and Christianity."[12] Everett went further. America, he believed, played a unique role in God's plans. In his "History of Liberty" speech, he argued that the system of standing armies which Europe adopted in the sixteenth century ended freedom on that continent. But to prevent the total destruction of liberty, God arranged for the discovery of America "to prepare the theatre for those events by which a new dispensation of liberty was to be communicated to man."[13] America was discovered, oppressive laws in England drove colonists to the New World, the Revolution liberated the colonies from English tyranny, and then the "final design of Providence" was fulfilled—the United States became a nation.[14] Providence, in order to sustain America as the abiding-place of liberty, "watched over the infancy of America, and gave the right direction to its first beginnings. . . ."[15] In a sense, then, Americans were God's chosen people.

[8] *Ibid.*, September 8, 1834, p. 3.
[9] *Orations*, 2nd ed. (Boston, 1850), II, 55.
[10] *An Oration Delivered at Plymouth, December 22, 1824* (Boston, 1825), p. 13.
[11] *Orations*, 1st ed. (Boston, 1836), p. 359. In subsequent editions, this speech was entitled "The Seven Years' War, the School of the Revolution."
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 589.
[13] *Ibid.*, p. 148.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 156.
[15] Speech at the dedication of the John Harvard monument, September 26, 1828; *ibid.*, p. 163.

Because of its freedom, Everett declared, America developed a culture superior to that of Europe. America's laboring population, he asserted, was more skillful, more energetic, and more productive than its European counterpart. The cause? "It is the spirit of a free country which animates and gives energy to its labor. . . ."[16] The farmer, too, was a beneficiary of America's free institutions. In speeches to agricultural societies and cattle fairs, Everett liked nothing better than to contrast the condition of the European serf and tenant with the American owner-farmer.[17] The scholar, too, benefited from free American institutions; for democracy, he declared, prompted Americans to keep well informed and to stress education.[18]

With God's special favor and its superior institutions, America served as an example to the world. In his Fourth of July oration, 1826, Everett asserted:

> With our example of popular government before their eyes, the nations of the earth will not eventually be satisfied with any other. With the French revolution as a beacon to guide them, they will learn, we may hope, not to embark too rashly on the mounting waves of reform. The cause, however, of popular government is rapidly gaining in the world. . . .
>
> And when we consider that it is our example, which has aroused the spirit of Independence from California to Cape Horn; that the experiment of liberty, if it had failed with us, most surely would not have been attempted by them; that even now our counsels and acts will operate as powerful precedents in this great family of republics, we learn the importance of the post which Providence has assigned us in the world.[19]

In developing such themes, Everett's favorite weapons were illustrations and adjectives. He loved to describe and to narrate scenes from American history. And the style of these descriptions and narrations shows his extreme patriotism. A deed was not simply a deed; it was "noble" or "inspiring." An act was not simply performed; it was done "gloriously." An ancestor was not simply an ancestor; he was "illustrious," "brave," "noble," "self-denying."

When drawing illustrative material from America's past, Everett emphasized the historical importance of the event, often by comparison with classical history. The day that the Revolution began was "a day as important as any recorded in the history of man."[20] Concerning the landing of the Pilgrims, Everett said, "no parallel exists in the history of the world." "It is the language not of exaggeration," he continued, "but of truth and soberness to say, that there is nothing in the accounts of Phenician, of Grecian, or of Roman colonization, that can stand the comparison."[21]

IV

Some believed that Everett overstressed nationalistic themes. In a review of Everett's Phi Beta Kappa address in 1824, Jared Sparks took issue with the orator's thesis that republican institutions are more conducive to intellectual progress than non-democratic institutions. "The rhetoric," he wrote, "is much more flowing and beautiful, than the logic is convincing."[22] Even Everett's good friend Hillard felt compelled to scold him on this same point: Mr. Everett's orations are nearly faultless, as

[16] *Orations*, 2nd ed. (Boston, 1850), II, 52.

[17] See, for example, his speech to the Massachusetts Agricultural Society, October 16, 1833, available in all editions of his *Orations*.

[18] See, for example, his Phi Beta Kappa oration, August 26, 1824, available in all editions of his *Orations* and in *American Philosophic Addresses: 1700-1900*, ed. Joseph L. Blau (New York, 1946), pp. 64-93.

[19] *An Oration Delivered at Cambridge on the Fiftieth Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence of the United States of America* (Boston, 1826), pp. 44-5.

[20] Speech commemorating the Battle of Concord, April 19, 1825; *Orations*, 1st ed., p. 85.

[21] Speech commemorating the landing of the Pilgrims, December 22, 1824; *ibid.*, p. 41.

[22] "Professor Everett's Orations," *North American Review*, XX (April 1825), 431.

literary efforts, and the only serious objection which we have to urge against them . . . is of a different kind, and partaking rather of a moral nature. We allude to the language of extravagant commendation, which he so frequently applies to our country, to our political institutions, to the events of our history, and to the great men who have shared in them. . . . He is too apt to feed that overweening national vanity, for which we are so conspicuous, and which makes us equally uneasy under the mild reproof of a judicious, and the ill-natured gibe of a prejudiced witness.[23]

There were other objections to Everett's oratory. Some thought him shallow; the best that John Forbes could say for him was that "he could speak smoothly."[24] Some regarded his oratory as tending too much toward display; even his close friend and admirer, Robert C. Winthrop, although regarding one of his speeches at a cattle show as a "beautiful speech," felt it was overloaded "with perhaps a little too much Latin for his audience."[25] Some listeners and critics thought his subjects were trite, although this animadversion was frequently tempered with praise of the orator's ability to treat old topics in a fresh and novel manner.

Despite adverse criticism, Everett's oratory was, in general, enthusiastically received. Scores of newspaper accounts demonstrate the favorable response of both reporters and audiences. For example, Everett's Fourth of July oration in 1826 was reported to have "enchained the attention of a crowded and delighted auditory. . . ."[26] His address commemorating the landing of Governor Winthrop "called forth the cheering approbation of every one present."[27] "We never heard on any occasion," the *Aurora* commented, "a more powerful and unanimous expression of approbation in an audience, than the orator called forth."[28] When Everett welcomed President Jackson to Bunker Hill, it was done, said the *Centinel*, "in a strain of eloquence scarcely ever superseded on earth. . . ."[29] His Fourth of July oration in 1833 was considered "a splendid exhibition of genius, taste, and learning —glowing with exalted patriotism."[30] He "poured forth the treasure of a highly cultivated mind, and a well stored memory, in such a manner as to elicit frequent bursts of applause from the audience."[31] Accounts of his Phi Beta Kappa address at Harvard in 1833 reported that "the audience followed the orator with admiration, and evidently shared his own enthusiasm. . . ."[32] His oration two years later to the literary societies at Amherst was to "a crowded and delighted audience."[33] Despite the tendency of newspapers of the period to indulge in uncritical praise, the abundance of such glowing accounts indicates that something more than eulogy was involved in these reports of Everett's popularity.

Examination of diaries, autobiographies, and similar materials also suggests that Everett was favorably received. John Quincy Adams described Everett's orations as "full of thought, of argument, and of eloquence, intermixed with a little humorous levity and a few

[23] G. S. Hillard, "Everett's Orations and Speeches," *North American Review*, XLIV (January 1837), 149-50.

[24] *Letters and Recollections of John Murray Forbes*, ed. Sarah Forbes Hughes (Boston, 1900), I, 33.

[25] Letter dated Sept. 29, 1851, cited by Robert C. Winthrop, Jr., *A Memoir of Robert C. Winthrop* (Boston, 1897), pp. 149-50.

[26] *Independent Chronicle & Boston Patriot*, July 12, 1826, p. 4.

[27] *Bunker-Hill Aurora*, July 17, 1830, p. 2.

[28] *Ibid.*, July 3, 1830, p. 2.

[29] *Columbian Centinel*, June 27, 1833, p. 2.

[30] *Independent Chronicle & Boston Patriot*, July 10, 1833, p. 1.

[31] Newspaper clipping, Everett Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society.

[32] *Independent Chronicle & Boston Patriot*, August 31, 1833, p. 1.

[33] *Boston Courier*, August 31, 1835, p. 3.

paradoxical fancies."[34] In 1836, after Everett gave Adams a copy of his collected *Orations,* the ex-president said of the speeches: "They are among the best ever delivered in this country, and, I think, will stand the test of time."[35] Robert C. Winthrop publicly described Everett as "our American Cicero"[36] and "delighted in listening to him on great occasions, considering him, in his particular line, unrivalled."[37] In 1850, long after his boyish enthusiasm for Everett had been dampened, Emerson recorded: "At the Concord Celebration [April 19, 1850] I was struck with the talent of Everett and Choate, and the delight of the people in listening to their eloquence. . . . There have been millions and millions of men, and a good stump orator only once in an age."[38] So well established was Everett's oratorical reputation that Charles Sumner could write, regarding his Phi Beta Kappa oration at Harvard in 1833: "Need I say that Everett did wonders on Phi Beta Day?"[39] And, on the same occasion, the young poet, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, asked that he be allowed to deliver his poem before Everett's oration "lest his lines seem colorless in contrast to the elegant phrases of his colleague."[40]

Reviews of Everett's published speeches were generally favorable. His Phi Beta Kappa address at Yale in 1833 was pronounced "absolutely perfect" by one critic,[41] "a rich and powerful production" by another.[42] His eulogy on John Quincy Adams was considered "a model of classic beauty inspired with Christian life."[43] Regarding his Fourth of July oration at Dorchester in 1855, the *Register* remarked: "We have read it with unbounded pleasure, and when we had finished it we felt a regret that there was no more of it."[44] When Everett published his second edition of collected addresses in 1850, one reviewer recommended that preachers and writers "throw away their favorite authors, and take up these volumes of Mr. Everett as a regular study. . . ."[45]

Clearly, then, the response of listeners and critics alike made Everett one of the most popular ceremonial orators of the day.

V

A universally valid rhetorical principle is that successful persuasion must be adapted to pre-existing audience attitudes. This principle is of great importance in explaining Everett's success. He was acutely aware that his listener—whether Whig or Democrat, farmer or urbanite, worker or banker, preacher or layman, scholar or illiterate—was strongly nationalistic.[46] And this, of course, explains in part why his speeches reflect intense patriotism.

Unfortunately for his success, audience attitudes gradually changed. As

[34] *Memoirs of John Quincy Adams,* ed. Charles Francis Adams (Philadelphia, 1874-77), VII, 138.

[35] *Ibid.,* IX, 305.

[36] *Addresses and Speeches on Various Occasions* (Boston, 1867), II, 646.

[37] Letter dated January 22, 1865, cited by Winthrop, Jr., *op. cit.,* p. 263.

[38] *Journals of Ralph Waldo Emerson,* ed. Edward Waldo Emerson and Waldo Emerson Forbes (Boston, 1912), VIII, 112.

[39] Sumner to Charlemagne Tower, September 1, 1833; Edwin L. Pierce, *Memoir and Letters of Charles Sumner* (Boston, 1877), I, 122.

[40] Lawrance Thompson, *Young Longfellow, 1807-1843* (New York, 1938), p. 193.

[41] "An Address delivered before the Phi Beta Kappa Society, in Yale College . . . ," (anon. rev.), *New England Magazine,* VI O.S. (January 1834), 89.

[42] "Everett's Phi Beta Kappa Address," *Christian Examiner,* XVI (March 1834), 1.

[43] "Notices of Recent Publications," *Christian Examiner and Religious Miscellany,* XLIV (May 1848), 471.

[44] "Dorchester in 1630, 1776, and 1855 . . . ," (anon. rev.), *New England Historical and Genealogical Register,* IX (October 1855), 369.

[45] "Everett's Orations and Speeches," *New Englander,* IX (February 1851), 50.

[46] See the preface to the second edition of his collected *Orations.*

sectional differences over abolition developed, audiences became less susceptible to nationalistic appeals. What was regarded as a great truth expounded in a Fourth of July oration in the 1820's was likely to be considered Fourth of July "froth" in the 1850's. It is not surprising, therefore, that Everett was relatively unproductive as a rhetorician in the years immediately following his return from England in 1845.[47] Nor is it astonishing that, when preparing his Bunker Hill oration in 1850, he should complain: "Employed all the day in vain attempts to say something interesting about Bunker-Hill. The fault may be in me, but it seems to me, there is no longer any patriotic feeling in the country. All interest in every other topic is eaten up by 'abolitionism'. . . ."[48]

Yet Everett's popularity persisted long after the growth of sectionalist attitudes. His nationalism, while of great significance, can not alone explain his overwhelming popularity. Hence we must look for additional rhetorical factors to explain his success.

Everett was expert at adapting himself to the audience and occasion in ways other than that of reflecting nationalism. For example, he was extremely careful to choose familiar anecdotes of local history which would flatter his audience. A speech in Charlestown or Concord was sure to contain information regarding the role of Charlestown or Concord citizens in some historical event. Such a speech was certain, too, to contain references to nearby places—the church which had been shelled or the field where a battle had been fought.

In choice of subject, too, Everett adapted himself well. When giving a Fourth of July oration in 1830 at Lowell, a manufacturing town, he spoke on "the connection of the growth of our manufactures with the independence of the country." His Phi Beta Kappa oration in 1824 treated "the peculiar motives to intellectual exertion in America." With such subjects, Everett could link his nationalistic themes with the interests of his particular audience and to the specific occasion.

Some of Everett's efforts to find a link with his audience descended almost to base flattery. At agricultural fairs and cattle shows he was careful to praise the "first pursuit of civilized man," agriculture. And at a mechanics' institute or a manufactures' meeting the importance of industry could hardly be overrated. But whether one chooses to call it skillful adaptation or sophistry, Everett could establish common ground with his audience and present a speech which was appropriate to the occasion. One of his contemporary critics believed that, "were we to select one trait in which he distances all rivals, and challenges our perpetual admiration, it would be his uniform sympathy with, adequacy for, and adaptation to the occasion. . . ."[49]

Everett was a master of amplification. Many of his contemporaries were impressed with his ability to amplify well-worn themes in a fresh and novel manner. One reviewer, for example, remarked of Everett's commencement address at Williams College: "The subject of this address is the trite one of Education, and the speaker does not attempt the exposition of any new theories or plans of his own, but confines himself to the expansion and illustra-

[47] A few of his successes, however, belong to the 1845-55 period. One must also remember that 1856 saw a resurgence of Everett's oratorical activity.

[48] Diary, May 24, 1850, Everett Papers, Mass. His. Soc.

[49] [A. P. Peabody], "Everett's Orations and Speeches," *North American Review*, XC (January 1860), 278.

tion of truths already received; but this is done with so much eloquence, so much taste, such wealth of allusion, and such grace of language, that every thing seems to wear the bloom of originality, and every paragraph appears the revelation of newly discovered truth."[50]

One of Everett's favorite methods of amplification was the narration. Although some of his stories obscured the point being illustrated, the rich imagery, abundance of detail, and the clearness of narration and description made them intensely interesting. Many of his contemporaries attested to his narrative skill. "His picturesque narrative," wrote one admirer, "is one of the most striking of his accomplishments. With what vividness does he make a long procession of events pass before our eyes, as in his Lexington, Concord, and Bloody Brook addresses, marshalling every thing into its proper place, without confusion or crowding! How agreeably he relates a familiar incident. . . ."[51] It may be emphasized that his habit of sprinkling his speeches with interesting, little-known historical anecdotes added freshness to his commonplace themes.

In his zeal for novelty, Everett often resorted to unusual methods. One listener reported that in his Lafayette eulogy he "freed himself entirely from any conventionality of the platform, as he turned his back upon his hearers to Stuart's [portrait of] Washington and to the bust of Lafayette which were behind him, and cried 'Break the long silence of that votive canvas! Speak! Speak! marble lips, and teach us the love of liberty protected by law."[52] He often displayed physical objects (a powder horn belonging to a revolutionary soldier to embellish his account of the battle of Lexington or an ear of corn to illustrate the contrast between California gold and Indian corn), believing "'that more use might be made in popular oratory, of visible symbols."[53]

Such methods, and especially such extreme devices as snatching a small flag which happened to be on the table in front of him and waving it in the air, appeared theatrical to some;[54] but given an attentive and sympathetic audience, they heightened his effect.

Everett's wordy and sometimes (especially in the early part of his career) overly ornate style possessed many pleasing qualities for the audience of his day. It abounded with figurative language. Choice of specific, concrete words, abundant use of descriptive words and modifiers, and use of the present tense when talking of the past combined to fill his speeches with imagery. Many writers commended his "polished style" and "command of language."

Everett almost always spoke without notes, a practice frequently commented upon by his contemporaries as, for example, when the *Journal,* in enthusiastic praise of his Phi Beta Kappa oration at Harvard in 1833, declared: "Nothing could exceed the splendor and power of the delivery. It seemed to realize what we read of the effect produced by Demosthenes and Cicero. He spoke without notes, and thus secured the entire eloquence of the countenance and the eye and all, with such ease and self-possession, that it seemed like inspiration. It is astonishing how

[50] "Everett's Address at Williamstown," *North American Review,* XLVII (July 1838), 262.

[51] Hillard, *op. cit.,* p. 140.

[52] Edward Everett Hale, *Memories of a Hundred Years* (New York, 1904), II, 23.

[53] Diary, October 26, 1855, Everett Papers, Mass. His. Soc.

[54] For some amusing incidents of this kind and an unsympathetic criticism of them, see "Editor's Easy Chair," *Harper's New Monthly Magazine,* XXX (March 1865), 534.

much is gained by committing an oration to memory and putting aside the notes. The effect is truly magical. . . ."[55]

His independence of notes helped give rise to a legend that he memorized his orations word for word simply by the process of writing them once. The truth of such a legend is, of course, suspect on the very face of it. Further, Everett himself admitted that he made several revisions of most speeches and that he deviated from his original manuscript. Examination of his diary reveals that his memory was not as fabulous as was commonly believed. For example, the preparation of his address in commemoration of Governor Winthrop's landing, delivered on June 28, 1830, was begun on June 16. He mentioned working on it June 18, 19, and 21. On June 24, he finished it and read it aloud to his wife; he made some revisions the following day. The diary entry for June 27 reveals that he "committed to memory a portion of my address for tomorrow."[56] Despite the exaggerated ideas about his memory, the fact remains that the legend contributed to his oratorical reputation and was encouraged by his independence of notes.

Some aspect of Everett's delivery apparently made him appear cold and mechanical. Although describing Everett's oratory as the "acme of American art," Goldwin Smith objected to his "every gesture" being "unmistakably prepared."[57] Nor is it without significance that several of Everett's eulogists, such as G. Washington Warren, felt obliged to refute the charge that Everett's oratory "was deficient in warmth and genuine feeling."[58] Thirteen years after Everett's death, in discussing Edwin Booth's severe coldness and formality, one writer compared Booth to Everett: "Booth is a miniature edition of Everett on the stage; when you hear him, you button your coat to keep from taking cold."[59]

Yet there is ample evidence that Everett's delivery contributed to his popularity. Even Emerson in his well-known sarcastic account of Everett's inauguration as president of Harvard felt compelled to say a few good words about the speaker's delivery: "Everett's grace and propriety were admirable through the day. Nature finished this man. He seems beautifully built, perfectly sound and whole; and eye, voice, hand exactly obey his thought. His quotations are a little trite, but saved by the beautiful modulation and falls of the recitation."[60]

Historical evidence suggests that Everett was physically well-equipped for his oratorical career. Whipple speaks of his "melodious voice"[61] and Loring describes him as having "an exquisite voice,—round, swelling, full of melody, particularly emotional; naturally grave, and with a touch almost of melancholy in some of its cadences, but, like all such emotional voices, admirably suited to the expression of humor, and of rising from a touching pathos into the most stirring, thrilling and triumphant tones."[62]

[55] *Boston Mercantile Journal,* August 30, 1833, p. 2.

[56] Everett Papers, Mass. His. Soc.

[57] Goldwin Smith, *Reminiscences* (New York, 1911), p. 405.

[58] *Proceedings of the Bunker Hill Monument Association at the Annual Meeting, June 17, 1865* (Boston, 1865), p. 45.

[59] *Indianapolis Journal,* January 31, 1878, p. 4. I am indebted to Professor Forrest Seal for discovering this quotation.

[60] *Journals of Ralph Waldo Emerson,* VII, 167-8.

[61] Edwin P. Whipple, *Character and Characteristic Men* (Boston, 1866), p. 251.

[62] Loring, *op. cit.,* p. 545.

VI

In summary, we may say that Everett was a highly popular ceremonial orator. His success was due in part to his reflection of nationalism through the subject matter, structure, themes, and amplification of his speeches. This, however, was not the only factor in his success. He was skillful in adapting his thoughts to the audience and to the occasion; he was a master at amplifying well-worn themes with interesting illustrations and anecdotes; his style possessed many pleasing qualities; his independence of notes gave rise to legends about his memory and increased the effectiveness of his presentation; his polished delivery, pleasing physical presence, and good voice all contributed to making him one of the most popular orators of the day.

Many of Everett's friends urged him to abandon ceremonial oratory for the production of a scholarly literary work. Others maintained that his rhetoric made a significant social contribution. "If he has not written a treatise in three volumes," one reviewer argued, "let him console himself with the thought that he has been doing something better—he has not thrown his life away—he has aided to stamp an age."[63]

Students of rhetoric would probably agree that Everett did indeed help stamp his age. His oratory helped provide the nation with heroes, symbols, and myths. It both contributed to, and reflected, the intense nationalism of the early nineteenth century. Perhaps this healthy nationalism passed into unhealthy chauvinism. But to condemn Everett's oratory is to condemn the period in which he lived, for Everett was not alone in his intensely nationalistic oratory.[64] For good or ill, his epideictic speaking helped create and sustain American nationalism; and judged by the standards of his day, especially the period 1824-1855, it was a worthwhile contribution.

[63] "Everett's Orations and Speeches," *Southern Quarterly Review,* XIX (April 1851), 458-59.

[64] See, for example, the discussion of Webster's epideictic oratory by Wilbur S. Howell and Hoyt H. Hudson in *A History and Criticism of American Public Address,* ed. William Norwood Brigance (New York, 1943), II, 676 ff.

TRUE ELOQUENCE

> True eloquence, indeed, does not consist in speech. It cannot be brought from far. Labor and learning may toil for it, but they will toil in vain. Words and phrases may be marshalled in every way, but they cannot compass it. It must exist in the man, in the subject, and in the occasion. Affected passion, intense expression, the pomp of declamation, all may aspire after it—they cannot reach it. It comes, if it come at all, like the outbreaking of a fountain from the earth, or the bursting forth of volcanic fires, with spontaneous, original, native force. The graces taught in the schools, the costly ornaments, and studied contrivances of speech, shock and disgust men, when their own lives, and the fate of their wives, their children, and their country, hang on the decision of the hour. Then words have lost their power, rhetoric is vain, and all elaborate oratory contemptible. Even genius itself then feels rebuked, and subdued, as in the presence of higher qualities.
>
> Daniel Webster, *A Discourse in Commemoration . . . of John Adams and Thomas Jefferson* (Boston: Cummings, Hilliard and Company, 1826), pp. 34-35.

THE FUNCTIONS OF RHETORICAL CRITICISM

Albert J. Croft

I

RESEARCH in rhetoric and oratory, as in any other art, ought to proceed from some clearly conceived set of relations between rhetorical theory, rhetorical criticism, and the history of public address. The statement of just what rhetorical research ought to produce can best be formulated by a re-examination of these relations. With that goal in mind, this article will pursue three main lines of inquiry: (1) that of describing or defining the aims, materials, and methods of the "standard" approach to rhetorical criticism; (2) that of analyzing some of the major inadequacies in the methods and objectives of this standard form; (3) that of proposing a revision of the aims of speech criticism. In discussing these three topics, a point of view will be presented as to the interrelations which ought to hold between theory, criticism, and history in rhetoric and public address.[1]

II

Any brief survey of what has been done in "rhetorical criticism" is bound to be controversial; so many different things go by this name. Still, there is no need for semantic controversy as to whether the term "criticism" can properly be applied to all of this research, for the only real issue is whether the research provides valuable conclusions. Among recent studies of speakers and speeches, however, there have been certain relatively common elements. The rhetorical critic selects for study either a single speaker and speech or groups of speeches and speakers representing periods, movements, regions, organizations, or ideas. His primary limitation is that he must focus on public speaking, per se. He then proceeds to analyze, report, interpret, and evaluate the speeches he has chosen for study.

The materials of these critical studies fall into three groups: (1) facts and opinions dealing with the biography of the speaker, the historical background of the speech, and the nature of the listening and reading audience; (2) the speaker's propositions as they occur in representative speeches (these propositions are derived by a wide variety of analytic devices); (3) illustrations of the speaker's use of Aristotle's three modes of proof and of various doctrines on style, arrangement, and delivery.

What, then, has the rhetorical critic done with this material? What has been his intention in assembling and examining all these data? Of what value are his conclusions, or what use can be made of them? What are the functions of this sort of rhetorical criticism? Being stylized, at least in format, nearly every graduate thesis based on these methods includes some formal statement of objective or purpose. Still, most of these statements somehow fail to provide satisfying answers to the questions being raised here. One is forced finally to examine these theses and

Albert J. Croft (Ph.D., Northwestern University, 1952) is Associate Professor of Speech and Chairman of his department at the University of Oklahoma.

[1] Although the approach of this article is very different from theirs, I am indebted to René Wellek and Austin Warren, *Theory of Literature* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1949), for their treatment of theory, criticism, and history in literature.

then simply to infer what their objectives and their contributions to knowledge seem to have been. Using that highly subjective method, I believe that the following four objectives are commonly implied in the "standard" critical studies completed in the last ten or twenty years.[2]

The first objective is to present a balanced and interesting picture of the life and speaking career of a famous speaker. In this way, scholars in speech have made several real contributions to British and American biography. It may be true, however, that such contributions are not inherently rhetorical.

A second objective is to present a synopsis of propositions asserted to be important in the speeches studied—to report, that is, what the speaker said in his speeches. These synopses contribute largely to political history. One might question what kind of summary will accurately represent the full content of a speech. How does one know when he has synopsized the right thing? Still, contributions to history have clearly been made by this means.

A third objective, less common in recent years, is to present a structure of causal relations between speeches or speaking careers and subsequent historical events. The critic asks, what part did these speakers or speeches play in determining the course of human affairs? What subsequent effects did the speeches have? Here his aim might be to explain historical developments, but there is some reason to question this sort of single-cause analysis. In terms of historical method, most events are obviously multi-causal, and the relative importance of one major cause as compared with another is very difficult to assess. Further, following Aristotle's definition of rhetoric, evaluation of speeches in terms of subsequent effect is usually unfair to the speeches.

A fourth objective is to describe the manner in which the speaking illustrates various doctrines of rhetoric. Some emphasis is usually placed on the classical rhetorical devices which the speaker used most often. The data sometimes allow quantitative generalizations about his techniques. Such conclusions are intended, one must assume, to contribute to our knowledge of rhetoric as a body of techniques.

These four objectives illustrate what can be inferred about the functions of contemporary rhetorical criticism by looking at "typical" graduate theses. Several excellent "non-typical" studies have of course made unique and meaningful contributions by working virtually outside the framework of the method described above.

III

Perhaps the chief problem of research in public address is that we have thought of it all as "criticism" when some is really theory, some is history, and some is criticism which has not evaluated the speeches studied. The argument of this article is that the methods and objectives of our research can be improved only as we clarify the relations between theory, criticism, and history. As these relations are explored, it will be possible to describe three major inadequacies in the standard forms of rhetorical research.

The relationship between theory and criticism involves an apparent paradox. In order to criticize a speech, the standards or criteria against which it is to be measured must first be established. These criteria are obviously drawn from established rhetorical theory and

[2] These conclusions are based on the examination of a number of complete theses, but an examination of the thesis abstracts prepared annually for *SM* by Clyde Dow also corroborates these conclusions.

must remain constant if we are to examine the speeches in terms of these criteria. But if we are to improve theory, then the standards and criteria by which we judge a speech cannot remain constant. We have resolved this paradox by deciding that criticism cannot alter theory; it can only use the existing forms.

Here is the contemporary situation: a researcher takes the old theory, finds illustrations of it, piles these up, and concludes, for example, that a given man's speaking exhibits characteristics which may be said to fall properly within the categories of traditional rhetoric. This sort of criticism works upon the presumption that rhetoric is rhetoric, and, beyond deciding which traditional doctrine he prefers, the critic shall not fancy himself a creative theorist. And so we have made rhetorical criticism a dead-end street. In this view, our first need is to create a dynamic interaction between theory and criticism; we must encourage creative theorizing as a part of criticism.

For a long time now much of the really interesting literature on rhetoric has been written by scholars outside the field of Speech. Examples of what I call creative theorizing and criticism can be found in Kenneth Burke's *Rhetoric of Motives*, Richard M. Weaver's *Ethics of Rhetoric*, or in the works of I. A. Richards. Such writers certainly do not scorn traditional theory; they use it as a solid base on which to stand while they experiment. They reinterpret older theory and then apply it in criticism. The standard forms of criticism within our field, however, treat traditional theory as a closed, fixed system. This is the first major inadequacy to be noted in our typical research, and it exists because of a naive notion of the relation between theory and criticism.

A second inadequacy is related to the hoary argument concerning form versus content, technique versus idea, in rhetoric and oratory. The important question here is not whether the "form" can be separated from the "content." Of course the two are separable; we can "see" a given form or technique in several different contexts by a process of simple abstraction. The question is how these abstracted forms can be most profitably used in criticism.

As noted above, a common device in graduate theses is to illustrate traditional theory, to find examples of a speaker's use of a particular rhetorical "form." Very little effort, if any, is made to evaluate these examples, to assert that an example is good or bad, better or worse. Often no critical conclusions are drawn, or only those which suggest that, because a speaker's techniques are amenable to description in traditional terms, the speaker's rhetoric is admirable. This approach cannot be called criticism in the sense of evaluation. Nor is it evaluation to assert that some instances of the speaker's reasoning satisfy the requirements of the Aristotelian syllogism, or that his modes of narrative and descriptive support seem to be especially vivid, or that his delivery was well received by audiences. There is a subtle but unmistakable implication in all these studies that the "critical" process is not even intended to produce judgments on the merit of the speech.

To a critic, the forms or techniques of an art are of no value in themselves, but are only tools with which to pry into a specimen of the art, the means that critics have found most useful in examining the specimen. Theory, or forms, ought to be used by the rhetorical critic so as to answer at least two major questions: (1) what are the various

levels of meaning implied by the form-content units in a speech—that is, what is the larger implicative meaning of the speech? (2) what are the unique and relatively artistic ways in which a particular speaker manipulates rhetorical forms in order to imply these meanings? Thus, one does not "criticize" by finding illustrations of standard, preconceived forms. He uses the framework of standard techniques as norms to help him discover and evaluate the ways in which a speaker's use of techniques is distinctive.

It does not seem to have occurred to many thesis writers that they are doing anything beyond simply looking for the traditional techniques of rhetoric in a group of speeches. After a while, the strictly rhetorical conclusions of one thesis tend to become remarkably similar to those of another using the same rhetorical categories, no matter how different the speaker or speeches may have been. This situation may have acted to drive many of these writers out of criticism and into history. This, in itself, would not be objectionable, but there are also problems in the rhetorical approach to history.

The third major area of inadequacy in rhetorical criticism involves the relation of theory and criticism to history. The concept of the "history" of an art has two clearly different aspects. First, there is the history of the art, per se, the record of the major changes in its organized theory. Thus we note the origins and development of rhetoric in Greek and Roman times and trace its theory through a series of variously conceived changes up to the present day. Or we trace the history of special doctrines of rhetoric. Or we deal with one or another of the philosophic issues on which the course of rhetorical theory has turned. By all these approaches our understanding of the total history of rhetoric has been broadened.

A second kind of history is concerned, not with theory, but with the practice of rhetoric; it is a history of oratory or of public address. Ideas in speeches, as a reflection of human society, become the center of this kind of historical study.[3]

The distinction between these two types of historical approach has been formalized and widely recognized by nearly every graduate department of Speech; still, confusion exists between these two historical functions in our teaching and our research.

In asking what the historian of public address is trying to do, we simply pose the age-long question of the function of rhetoric itself. But no matter what answer is given, the center of this kind of study is audience adaptation, or, as Donald Bryant puts it, the accommodation of ideas to men and men to ideas. Even though this adaptive process is admittedly the *sine qua non* of rhetoric, studies in rhetorical criticism and in the history of public address have not been able to deal directly with it. It is not enough to talk separately about the make-up of an audience at one point, about the main propositions of the speaker at another point, and about the speaker's use of traditional rhetorical techniques at still another point. The main function of history and criticism is to show how propositions and audiences are *connected;* how a speaker uses techniques to adapt his ideas to the ideas of his audiences.

[3] It may be that in some types of "art" the history of theory and the history of practice tend to duplicate each other. But in rhetoric the whole function of the art is to affect the shape of society in practical ways. The history of what has been done by speakers must deal with substantive matters, not forms or general theories.

The fault of some modern criticism has not been in wholly ignoring this necessity, but rather in devising inadequate tools to deal with it.[4] Here again an unfortunate distinction between form and content appears. Adaptation aims at the modification of certain ideas in the audience by relating them to other ideas. Here "ideas" must be taken to mean either groups of didactic propositions or, at the other extreme, mere sentiments or predispositions. As long as they are statable, they are ideas. Rhetorical adaptation can be dealt with usefully only at the level of ideas, and not at the level of techniques abstracted from their ideational context. If the rhetorical critic were to analyze, report, and interpret *ideas*, using rhetorical forms as instruments, then valuable historical understandings might be contributed. But the aim of the critic is often simply to point out the rhetorical devices of a speech as forms, not as "idea-adaptation." We argue that adequate speech criticism requires a knowledge of the historical background of the speech; yet this kind of discussion of a speaker's rhetoric ignores the historical and biographical data. The *historical* contribution of such a study is in no way different from that of any historian, untrained and uninterested in rhetoric. The fundamental point, I repeat, is that research in public address by those trained in both rhetoric and history could be focused on audience adaptation to produce unique and interesting historical insights. Most theses following the standard method of rhetorical criticism have done little beyond the writing of political history. Rhetorical theory and criticism ought to have a special relation to the history of public address which graduate research has not yet fully recognized.

[4] In the average thesis, audience adaptation is illustrated by such matters as whether the speaker used examples drawn from the local community or recognized the immediate audience in his introduction. These matters are wholly peripheral to the real process of audience adaptation—to the job of fitting the speaker's basic social values to those of the listeners.

IV

Questionable aspects of contemporary rhetorical criticism have been pointed out by various writers. My real purpose here is not to do the same thing, but to reformulate the objectives toward which future rhetorical criticism should be directed. There is no need for all research in rhetoric to follow a single pattern. Indeed, a pluralistic approach to research is the only intellectually defensible position. Still, if the foregoing analysis of existing inadequacies in rhetorical research is accepted, then the objectives which ought to operate are somewhat as follows: (1) to report and interpret the manner in which a speaker's social values have been related to the social values of his audiences in the course of his rhetorical adaptation—this is the historical function of criticism; (2) to evaluate particular speeches and speakers by estimating the appropriateness and evaluating the uniqueness of the idea-adaptation in them—this is the evaluative function of criticism; (3) to re-examine, re-evaluate, and if possible to modify contemporary rhetorical theory through the examination of the adaptive processes in speeches—this is the creative function of criticism.

The acceptance of these objectives of historical interpretation, critical evaluation, and creative theorizing would clearly require us to devise certain new methods. I have space to indicate only a few of these methodological implications.

Historical interpretation requires that the central propositions of a speech

be approached in terms of the receptivity of the audience to the ideas the speaker intended to convey. The basic materials of such an analysis are the popular ethical or social values involved in the subject. The speech will assert and compare, deprecate or heighten, and finally unite these values to imply social action. The propositions of a speech become acceptable to listeners only as they are made to derive from the listeners' values or as some attempt to modify or redirect the listeners' values is made. Consider the differences between "socialized industry" and "socialized secondary school education." An attempt to deal with the conflicting popular values implied in these terms would involve much more than semantic acuity; it would also demand an understanding of the ways in which specific groups of people have developed different attitudes toward these ideas. This kind of interpretation will produce something quite different from the usual political history; a kind of sociology of ideas is involved, or a history of public philosophies.[5]

However, a single, static concept of these popular values is neither possible nor valuable. Human values can be talked about only as constellations of attitudes moving through qualitative changes in historical continuity. The effort to comprehend this "history of ideas" is at the center of speech criticism, for rhetorical adaptation can be understood only on the basis of an adequate historical perspective on these germinal values. Not only must a study in rhetorical criticism (as historical interpretation) proceed on the basis of some such perspective, but, in turn, each additional study should expand and deepen the available perspective. In this manner, a meaningful history of public address can be created.[6]

My view of research in rhetoric derives directly from classical concepts of the function of rhetoric. The ethos, pathos, and argument of a speech can be investigated only in terms of specific patterns of value operating in specific listeners and speakers at specific places and times. Thus, historical interpretation may be thought of as the examination of speeches by reaching back in time and place to estimate ethos, pathos, or argument.

Yet even those who agree with this objective quail at the prospect of digging out these imbedded values. Anyone who has searched for such values among the bare printed words of an unfamiliar speech can testify to its difficulties. Still, this is one of the main directions which history itself has taken, from W. E. H. Lecky and James Harvey Robinson through Henry Steele Commager, Merle Curti, and Crane Brinton. A good biography, like Perry's study of William James, involves philosophy and literature as well as history.[7] Rhetorical criticism, however, has somehow felt that this sort of nondepartmental approach does violence to its real function. If the criticism of

[5] Note that this historical approach to criticism is not concerned with demonstrating that speeches *caused* subsequent events; its intention is to reveal the pattern of popular ideas which *accompanied* events in history.

[6] See E. J. Wrage, "Public Address: A Study in Social and Intellectual History," *QJS*, XXXIII (1947), 451-457.

[7] Several recent publications in history are of great value to this sort of historical interpretation of speeches. One which should become "must reading" for all graduate students in rhetoric and public address is *Harvard Guide to American History* by Oscar Handlin et al. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1954), especially the articles on historical method. An interesting background of this problem of method is provided in Edward N. Saveth's *Understanding the American Past* (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1954). Perhaps the best brief philosophy of history now in print is contained in H. J. Muller, *The Uses of the Past* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1952); see especially p. 69.

public address continues to turn inward on itself, and remains content with duplicative studies which pile up artificial samples of rhetorical techniques (apart from the ideas they contain), then rhetorical criticism will have passed up its most significant scholarly function.

Beyond historical interpretation lies the second objective of rhetorical criticism, the evaluation of instances of public address—the passing of judgment on the relative worth of speeches. Much "historical interpretation" has been attempted, but one searches the pages of research studies in vain for deliberate judgments of comparative merit. Perhaps such evaluation is not deemed important, but the only extended treatment of rhetorical criticism now in print argues that evaluation is the central objective of critical research.[8] The question is, what sort of comparative judgments can and should be passed on speeches?

The principal difficulty of speech criticism is that we are not really able to evaluate a man's skill as a speaker apart from his ideas (his beliefs, attitudes, etc.). The usual course, as noted above, is to abstract the speaker's techniques from the idea-content and to discuss their similarity to the norms of classical theory. Like historical interpretation, this evaluation of technique ought to be centered on idea adaptation, but the difficulty lies in the stubborn complexity and opaqueness of adaptation.

Improvement in methods for evaluating adaptation should probably begin with the presumption that technique cannot be evaluated apart from its content. The next presumption should be that adaptation can only be analyzed as an overt attempt by a speaker to connect certain larger ethical-social values with specific proposals for social action, either immediate or delayed. That is to say, the speaker's aim is to secure audience acceptance of certain end-values, and then to demonstrate that the actions being urged are more consistent with those values than are any others.

Based on these presumptions, rhetorical evaluation will attempt to discover the following things: (1) the basic values on which the speaker rests his specific proposals; (2) the specific proposals themselves; (3) the manner in which the speaker attempts to connect values with proposals in the minds of his audience; (4) the extent to which these connections were appropriate to the audience being addressed. These various "connections" are not simply "logical appeals"; the connections will be established in the listener's mind by virtue of all kinds of appeal in the speech. The form of these connections, when abstracted from their idea-content, will be classifiable in terms of traditional rhetorical devices. But the important point is that the rhetorical form is only an aid in evaluating the success with which a speaker selected and established the most appropriate idea relationships in the speech.[9]

Like a critic in any field, the rhetorical critic must discover the *uniqueness* of a given speaker's efforts at adaptation. Every speaker's adaptation will be relatively unique in terms of content, and it is not simply the bizarre or extraordinary form of adaptation which

[8] See Lester Thonssen and A. Craig Baird, *Speech Criticism* (New York: Ronald Press Company, 1948).

[9] The lists of "reaction tendencies," "psychological appeals," "basic human motives," etc., which appear in most rhetoric textbooks are of no great value to the critic of speeches. It is the particular value and the specific action proposition connected with it which supply the basic data by which a speech may be evaluated, not the generalized category or the abstract form.

we seek. Still, a speaker's uniqueness remains a function of the appropriateness of his adaptation to all the discoverable factors in the situation as that speaker faced it. To repeat, the great need in criticism is for specific methods by which to pursue this aim.

Some critics have attempted to avoid the necessity of this sort of subjective judgment by experimenting with quasi-scientific devices for measuring the elements of the speaking situation, or for correlating a rhetorical technique with an audience response. Experimental research can undoubtedly test, and may even change, much of rhetorical theory, but the way to critical evaluation will not be thus supplied. The final choice involved in any evaluative judgment is by definition subjective. Ultimately, the evaluation of greater or less rhetorical effectiveness must rest on the construction of careful historical hypotheses. The critic must be willing to immerse himself in the available data on the speech in its time, and then to make a straightforward judgment on the manner in which the speaker used the "best available means of persuasion" in terms of the specific ideas of the speaker and his audience. Such judgments will involve personal estimates of the objective "rightness" of the speaker's system of values, as well as of the potential effectiveness of these values as persuasion. No experimental or scientific device can be substituted for these processes, nor should it be. This situation is not an evil; on the contrary, it may yet force us to produce the greatest contribution which criticism can make.[10]

There is, however, a major objection to the type of criticism being urged here: it is difficult. This "difficulty" comes down to a matter of how long it takes to do it, for no one would have the temerity to argue the superiority of a method simply because it is easier than others. The time-consuming aspect of this sort of research is undeniable, but that very fact introduces the larger problem of limiting the scope of research in public address.

It would seem wholly appropriate for a doctoral thesis, pursuing the method I have suggested here, to be devoted to a study of the two inaugural addresses of Lincoln, or to Clay's lengthy address on the compromise of 1850, or to three or four selected sermons by Theodore Parker. What about some representative selections from the Scopes trial speeches, or the McCarthy hearings, or the political conventions of 1896 or 1912, or the Harvard Phi Beta Kappa addresses, or the meetings of the 1954 Ecumenical group at Evanston, Illinois? Some of these topics have been previously treated, in one way or another, but could anyone argue that the substance of one of these topics is no longer adequate to support intensive study by other doctoral candidates? The point is that interpretative or evaluative studies following the line suggested in this article can be managed only on subjects of limited scope. The time is overdue when doctoral theses in Speech should be less compendious and more thorough, and the presumption that every graduate student must have a whole new speaker of his own is preposterous.

The third function of research in rhetoric, in addition to historical interpretation and critical evaluation, is to modify or add to rhetorical theory itself. This function has been referred to throughout the above remarks, and only one further point need be added. The central issue in modern Speech ed-

[10] On this point, see the function of criticism as outlined by Lionel Trilling in *The Liberal Imagination* (New York: Doubleday and Company, 1950).

ucation lies in the area of the ethics of rhetoric. The conception of rhetoric as simply a bag of tricks has been denied all the way from Plato's distrust of the Sophists to the modern distrust of Dale Carnegie. Yet the answer lies not in arguing that we must teach Speech as an "art," but in recognizing that the real difference between a defensible rhetoric and a modern sophistry can be delineated only through a fundamentally ethical criticism of the value-action connections which make up the real persuasion of a speech. Like the creative theorist in economics or political science, we can no longer leave ethics to the philosophy department.

From this point of view, rhetorical criticism takes on special importance for the future of Speech education, and ultimately for the future of a society dominated by mass communication. As Speech courses grow more and more "gimmicky," the need to reformulate theory through "ethical criticism" is very great. "Principles" of speech there must be, but training in Speech from Isocrates and Quintilian to our time has always been responsible for producing something more than "pitch men." As criticism in the graduate school goes, so goes rhetorical theory and teaching.

The view on research in rhetoric as expressed in this article rests on the viewpoint taken toward the relationships of theory, criticism, and history in our field. These relationships may be summarized as follows: (1) Rhetorical theory, as a basis for criticism, should consist of a series of formal techniques drawn from the history of rhetorical theory and unified into a general system. (2) A dynamic interaction should be maintained between this body of theory and current criticism; criticism should slowly but continuously remold theory. (3) Criticism should go beyond concern with purely formal rhetorical concepts; it must enter the field of making specific value judgments of the appropriateness and rightness of the idea adaptation to be found in speeches; criticism must *evaluate* speeches. (4) Criticism should provide the much needed monographs from which to construct an "idea-centered" history of public address. (5) Historical interpretation, critical evaluation, and creative theorizing must all become directly concerned with the ethics of rhetoric.

IMPORTANCE OF THE ART OF ORATORY

> Very few persons ever find themselves at a loss to deliver a single sentence or two at a time; because they are able to see at one view the whole of what they intend to say. But it is not common to find a person able to acquit himself with propriety in a speech of considerable length, even though he prepare himself by digesting beforehand all that he intends to say; because the *order* and *connexion of sentiment*, and variety of *diction*, necessary in a continued speech, are not easily carried in memory: and it requires a very extraordinary invention and recollection to speak long, in a proper and graceful manner, quite *extempore*. . . . For this reason we see many persons who make a good figure in conversation, by no means able to make a speech, or a composition of any considerable length. It is in this respect, where the powers of nature fail us, in expressing our sentiments to advantage, that we have recourse to the *art of Oratory*.
>
> Joseph Priestley, *A Course of Lectures on Oratory and Criticism* (London, 1777), p. 2.

THE FORUM

ELECTION OF 1957 OFFICERS

The first election under the new Constitution was conducted during May. Over 1,700 members returned their ballots. The following persons were elected:

SECOND VICE-PRESIDENT

John E. Dietrich, Ohio State U., Columbus, O.

MEMBERS OF ADMINISTRATIVE COUNCIL

Robert D. Clark, U. of Oregon, Eugene, Ore.

Karl F. Robinson, Northwestern U., Evanston, Ill.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

MEMBERS AT LARGE

Three Year Term

John W. Bachman, Union Theological Seminary, New York, N. Y.

Barnet Baskerville, U. of Washington, Seattle, Wash.

C. C. Bender, Emerson Col., Boston, Mass.

Gladys L. Borchers, U. of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

Earnest S. Brandenburg, Washington U., St. Louis, Mo.

Maybelle Conger, Central H. S., Oklahoma City, Okla.

W. Roy Diem, Ohio Wesleyan U., Delaware, O.

Wofford G. Gardner, U. of Maine, Orono, Me.

Warren Guthrie, Western Reserve U., Cleveland, O.

Frederick W. Haberman, U. of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

Theodore D. Hanley, Purdue U., Lafayette, Ind.

Robert C. Jeffrey, U. of Virginia, Charlottesville, Va.

Claude E. Kantner, Ohio U., Athens, O.

John W. Keltner, Kansas State Col., Manhattan, Kans.

Paul Kozelka, Teachers Col., Columbia U., New York, N. Y.

Norman W. Mattis, U. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.

A. Florence May, Tuskegee Institute, Tuskegee, Ala.

Richard Murphy, U. of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

Theodore F. Nelson, St. Olaf Col., Northfield, Minn.

Dean G. Nichols, U. of Wyoming, Laramie, Wyo.

E. Ray Nichols, Jr., Whittier Col., Whittier, Calif.

David Potter, Michigan State U., East Lansing, Mich.

Horace W. Robinson, U. of Oregon, Eugene, Ore.

James L. Robinson, U. of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.

Edward Stasheff, U. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Marion Cass Tripp, Childrens Rehabilitation Institute for Cerebral Palsy, Reisterstown, Md.

Otis Monroe Walter, Jr., U. of Houston, Houston, Texas.

Charlotte G. Wells, U. of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.

Albert E. Whitehead, U. of Idaho, Moscow, Ida.

Margaret L. Wood, Illinois State Teachers Col., DeKalb, Ill.

Two Year Term

John Wm. Ackley, San Diego Col., San Diego, Calif.

Wynett Barnett, Wisconsin State Col., Whitewater, Wis.

Fred J. Barton, Abilene Christian Col., Abilene, Texas

Wayne E. Brockriede, U. of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.

William A. Conboy, U. of Kansas, Lawrence, Kan.

LeRoy Cowperthwaite, Kent State U., Kent, O.

Rupert L. Cortright, Wayne U., Detroit, Mich.

Jack Erskine Douglas, U. of Oklahoma, Norman, Okla.

Henry L. Ewbank, Jr., Purdue U., Lafayette, Ind.

Seth A. Fessenden, Montana State U., Missoula, Mont.

Paul W. Gauger, U. of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.

Leland M. Griffin, Northwestern U., Evanston, Ill.

Mrs. Annabel Dunham Hagood, U. of Alabama, University, Ala.

Thelma A. Knudson, South Bend Pub. Schls., South Bend, Ind.

P. Merville Larson, Texas Technological Col., Lubbock, Texas

Elaine McDavitt, Iowa State Teachers Col., Cedar Falls, Iowa.

Mrs. Alethea Smith Mattingly, U. of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.
N. Edd Miller, U. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Wayne C. Minnick, Northwestern U., Evanston, Ill.
Raymond H. Myers, U. of Wisconsin, Milwaukee, Wis.
John J. Pruis, Western Michigan Col., Kalamazoo, Mich.
Brooks Quimby, Bates Col., Lewistown, Me.
Carrie Rasmussen, Madison Pub. Schls., Madison, Wis.
Mary Margaret Robb, U. of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.
Lousene G. Rousseau, Harper and Brothers, New York, N. Y.
Earl H. Ryan, Col. of the City of New York, New York, N. Y.
Joseph F. Smith, U. of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H.
William E. Utterback, Ohio State U., Columbus, Ohio.
John A. Walker, Michigan State U., East Lansing, Mich.
Dorothy M. Youngblood, East H. S., Aurora, Ill.

One Year Term

Otis J. Aggertt, Albion Col., Albion, Mich.
Joseph H. Baccus, U. of Redlands, Redlands, Calif.
C. Laverne Bane, U. of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah
George V. Bohman, Wayne U., Detroit, Mich.
Winston L. Brembeck, U. of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
Glenn R. Capp, Baylor U., Waco, Texas
Clark S. Carlile, Idaho State Col., Pocatello, Ida.
Paul Alfred Carmack, Ohio State U., Columbus, Ohio.
Mrs. Elizabeth B. Carr, U. of Hawaii, Honolulu, T. H.
Martin T. Cobin, U. of Illinois, Urbana, Ill.
Lionel G. Crocker, Denison U., Granville, Ohio
Laura Crowell, U. of Washington, Seattle, Wash.
Delwin B. Dusenbury, Temple U., Philadelphia, Pa.
Marceline Louise Erickson, Mankato State Teachers Col., Mankato, Minn.
Thorrel B. Fest, U. of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.
Austin J. Freeley, Boston U., Boston, Mass.
Robert G. Gunderson, Oberlin Col., Oberlin, O.
Robert Haakenson, U. of Missouri, Columbia, Mo.
Bruno E. Jacob, National Forensic League, Ripon, Wis.
E. Orville Johnson, Earlham, Col., Richmond, Ind.
Herold Lillywhite, U. of Oregon Medical School, Portland, Ore.
Klonda Lynn, U. of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.
Robert C. Martin, Lake Forest Col., Lake Forest, Ill.
Alan H. Monroe, Purdue U., Lafayette, Ind.
John S. Penn, U. of North Dakokta, Grand Forks, N. Dak.
Owen M. Peterson, Louisiana State U., Baton Rouge, La.
Donald C. Streeter, Memphis State Col., Memphis, Tenn.
Joseph Anthony Wagner, Long Beach State Col., Long Beach, Calif.
Grace Walsh, Wisconsin State Col., Eau Claire, Wis.
Forest L. Whan, Kansas State Col., Manhattan, Kans.
Joseph E. Wright, Vanderbilt U., Nashville, Tenn.

GEOGRAPHICAL AREA MEMBERS

Eastern Area: Three Year Term

Carroll C. Arnold, Cornell U., Ithaca, N. Y.
Magdalene Kramer, Teachers Col., Columbia U., New York, N. Y.
David C. Phillips, U. of Connecticut, Storrs, Conn.
Joseph F. O'Brien, Pennsylvania State U., State College, Pa.

Eastern Area: Two Year Term

J. Calvin Callaghan, Syracuse U., Syracuse, N. Y.
Wilbur E. Gilman, Queens Col., Flushing, N. Y.
Eleanor M. Luse, U. of Vermont, Burlington, Vt.
Robert T. Oliver, Pennsylvania State U., State College, Pa.

Eastern Area: One Year Term

Geraldine Garrison, Connecticut State Dept. of Ed., Hartford, Conn.
Gordon F. Hostettler, Temple U., Philadelphia, Pa.
Letitia E. Raubicheck, Board of Ed., New York, N. Y.
Melvin R. White, Brooklyn Col., Brooklyn, N. Y.

Central Area: Three Year Term

William S. Howell, U. of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn.
William M. Sattler, U. of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich.
Hugh F. Seabury, State U. of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa
Wayne N. Thompson, U. of Ill., Chicago Div., Navy Pier, Chicago, Ill.

Central Area: Two Year Term

Charles L. Balcer, State Teachers Col., St. Cloud, Minn.
Samuel L. Becker, State U. of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa
Kim Giffin, U. of Kansas, Lawrence, Kans.
Martin J. Holcomb, Augustana Col., Rock Island, Ill.

Central Area: One Year Term

G. Bradford Barber, Illinois State Normal U., Normal, Ill.
Charlotte I. Lee, Northwestern U., Evanston, Ill.
Victor M. Powell, Wabash Col., Crawfordsville, Ind.
M. D. Steer, Purdue U., Lafayette, Ind.

Southern Area: Three Year Term

Sara Lowrey, Furman U., Greenville, S. C.
Harold Weiss, Southern Methodist U., Dallas, Texas
Joseph C. Wetherby, Duke U., Durham, N. C.
Eugene E. White, University of Miami, Miami, Fla.

Southern Area: Two Year Term

C. Cordelia Brong, Louisiana State U., Baton Rouge, La.
Frank B. Davis, Alabama Polytechnic Inst., Auburn, Ala.
Mary Louise Gehring, Mississippi Southern Col., Hattiesburg, Miss.
Jesse J. Villarreal, U. of Texas, Austin, Texas

Southern Area: One Year Term

Stanley H. Ainsworth, U. of Gerogia, Athens, Ga.
Douglas Ehninger, U. of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.
Claude L. Shaver, Louisiana State U., Baton Rouge, La.
Franklin R. Shirley, Wake Forest Col., Wake Forest, N. C.

Western Area: Three Year Term

Virgil A. Anderson, Stanford U., Stanford, Calif.
Wayne C. Eubank, U. of New Mexico, Albuquerque, N. M.
Norman Wm. Freestone, Occidental Col., Los Angeles, Calif.
Earl W. Wells, Oregon State Col., Corvallis, Ore.

Western Area: Two Year Term

Mrs. Vera Breinholt, Orange Co. Pub. Schls., Santa Ana, Calif.
William B. McCoard, U. of Southern Calif., Los Angeles, Calif.
Elwood Murray, U. of Denver, Denver, Colo.
Upton S. Palmer, U. of California, Santa Barbara, Calif.

Western Area: One Year Term

Arthur Cable, U. of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz.
S. Judson Crandell, State Col. of Washington, Pullman, Wash.
Susie S. Niles, Pub. Schls., Salt Lake City, Utah.
Garff Wilson, U. of California, Berkeley, Calif.

APPOINTMENTS

1 May, 1956

To Members of the Administrative Council, Officers of Interest Groups, Chairmen of Committees, and Other Interested Persons

I thought perhaps you might like to know about certain appointments which have been made recently in the management of the affairs of the Association.

Professor Wayne Thompson of the University of Illinois, Chicago Division, has been named to the Clerkship of the Legislative Assembly.

The following committees are at work on the specified projects:

Committee to delineate the boundaries between and the scope of the SAA publications
Dallas C. Dickey
Franklin H. Knower
Bower Aly, *Chairman*

Committee to determine the Life Membership fee
Gail E. Densmore
Wayne C. Eubank
W. Norwood Brigance, *Chairman*

Committee to investigate the feasibility of taking space in the NEA Building in Washington
J. Jeffery Auer
Paul D. Bagwell
Orville A. Hitchcock
James H. McBurney
Karl R. Wallace, *Chairman*

Committee to nominate the Editor of *The Speech Teacher* for the term 1958-1960
Gladys L. Borchers
Donald E. Hargis
Wanda B. Mitchell
Henry L. Mueller
Dallas C. Dickey, *Chairman*

Committee to determine the qualifications for Emeritus Membership
Rupert L. Cortright
W. Hayes Yeager
Wilbur E. Gilman, *Chairman*

Soon I shall appoint a committee to nominate the Executive Vice-President for the term 1958-1960.

Please accept my best wishes for a pleasant summer vacation.

Cordially yours,
LESTER THONSSEN,
President

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO NOMINATE THE EDITOR OF *THE SPEECH TEACHER* FOR THE TERM 1958-1960

The President of the Speech Association of America appointed the undersigned to serve as a committee to present to the Administrative Council at its 1956 meeting in Chicago a nominee for the post of Editor of *The Speech Teacher* for the term following that of the present editor.

In accordance with that appointment, the committee nominates Karl F. Robinson of Northwestern University for the years 1958-1960.

Respectfully submitted,
GLADYS L. BORCHERS
DONALD E. HARGIS
WANDA B. MITCHELL
HENRY L. MUELLER
DALLAS C. DICKEY, *Chairman*

INCREASING AND USING THE SUPPLY OF TEACHERS OF SPEECH

To the Editor:

The American Council on Education, in its thirty-eighth annual meeting, October 6-7, 1955, in Washington, centered its attention on "Goals and Progress in Planning for the Future of Higher Education." Attended by nearly 650 delegates of member institutions and organizations, this was the largest annual meeting in the Council's history, a testimonial to the enormity of the problems under consideration. The Speech Association of America is a constituent member of the Council, and I attended this meeting as its official delegate. What follows here is in the nature of a report, with special emphasis upon the kinds of questions which the Council's deliberations raised in my mind as being of special concern to college and university departments of Speech. Primarily these questions are outgrowths of the sectional meetings on "How Is the Supply of Able College Teachers Being Increased?" and "How Can the Available Educational Resources Be Stretched?"

In discussing the problem of recruiting more college faculty members, Council delegates faced the simple fact that there will be a need for 250,000 new college teachers by 1970, with less than half that number now being trained in our graduate schools. Every Speech department can foresee its own needs within that enormous, though conservative, figure. If, on the average, a doubling of present staffs is to be required in the next fifteen years, steps will need to be taken now to add to the available supply, lest the ultimate recruiting solution consist merely of stronger and richer institutions raiding the weaker and poorer ones. As this delegate to the Council reflects on what needs to be done, these steps are obvious:

1. Speech department faculties should make concerted efforts to interest their most promising students in becoming college teachers of Speech. By their own teaching they should demonstrate the attractiveness of college teaching as a profession. They should make available all possible information about graduate assistantships, fellowships, and part-time instructorships which will help those qualified but financially limited students to pursue graduate work in Speech. They should call attention to the Woodrow Wilson Fellowship program and the Fellowship Program of the Social Science Research Council, both of which are especially devised to interest prospective college teachers. They should also be aware of such other special graduate fellowship re-

source agencies as the Council of Southern Universities.

2. Speech department faculties should explore the possibility of recruiting retired teachers of known competence to accept appointments as visiting professors, even on a part-time basis. They should inquire specifically into the programs of the John Hay Whitney Foundation and the New York Foundation, established to give financial aid both to retired teachers and to institutions and make possible the further employment of outstanding but statutorily retired members of our profession.

3. Speech department faculties should explore the possibilities of securing adjunct professors to teach one or more courses for which their regular employment specially qualifies them. Some institutions of higher learning are already using this method of supplementing their faculties from within their own communities, and it is a procedure especially adaptable to departments of Speech. From men and women in business and industry, in the clergy, and in secondary schools, for example, adjunct professors may well be recruited for courses in such areas as radio and television, theatre, and business communication.

4. Speech department faculties should note and keep in touch with their most promising majors who enter elementary or secondary teaching after graduation; and should encourage those who are potentially suited for college teaching to return later for graduate work and, ultimately, college faculty appointments. Such a procedure may seem unfriendly to the needs of secondary schools, but if secondary school experience were seen to help some teachers move to college positions, this might add to the appeal of secondary schools.

5. Speech department faculties might use similar diligence in maintaining contact with their most promising majors who enter the military services following graduation. Between commencement-day intentions and discharge-day decisions many promising college teachers are lost, but continued encouragement from their major professors might save them.

6. Finally, of course, Speech department faculties, like all faculties and administrations, must work constantly at making college teaching more attractive by providing better financial as well as psychic income. Salary increases are basic to this end, but "fringe benefits" such as annuity and insurance contributions are equally important in building security for the teaching profession, and the availablity of both time and grants for research has significant, though less universal, appeal.

In addition to the discussion of increasing the supply of teachers, the Council meeting considered ways of using the supply more efficiently. As a first step in this area, Speech department faculties might well review their curricular offerings to discover whether some judicious elimination, consolidation, or reorganization of present courses might not serve our educational ends as well, and still make more efficient use of teaching time. These might be some lines of inquiry:

1. Are we overexpanded in our total course offerings? The academic man is proliferous, and all too likely to break down a single "Rhetorical Theory" course into an elaborate series such as "Ancient Rhetoric," "Medieval Rhetoric," "Renaissance Rhetoric," and "Modern Rhetoric," with a special course on Aristotle as lagniappe. Or we may teach "Introducton to Play Direction," "Elements of Play Production," "Advanced Directing," "Special Problems in Directing," and "Problems in Directing Period Productions," with

a parallel series of offerings in technical direction. The existence of courses of such narrow scope may offer no concern, even philosophically, to those departments whose classes are up to capacity; but, for those whose enrollments in each of such courses are below par, some thought might be given to whether it is better to have six students in each of five rhetoric courses, or fifteen in each of two. The basic question is not only one of educational philosophy but also of whether a given department can afford to spread its increasingly precious teaching resources over its present course base. (One department of Speech has recently abolished separate courses in acting for theatre, radio, and television, in favor of a single, integrated course.)

2. Turning now to courses that are primarily designed to increase personal skill in oral communication, we might consider how many such courses should properly be included in the undergraduate major program. (I assume that there is little problem in arranging a basic course for the terminal student.) Some institutions, with major requirements as high as thirty hours, permit a student to elect a full program of skill courses, such as public speaking, debate, discussion, radio speaking, acting, and oral reading. This may be a sound procedure, but certainly a department, faced with handling more students with perhaps proportionately fewer teachers, ought to re-examine a philosophy which devotes the bulk of its teaching to skill courses which, by their very nature, must be limited in enrollments.

3. There is a growing tendency to offer proficiency examinations, particularly in foreign language departments, as a result of which certain able students may enter directly into the higher courses and skip the lower. This is in part an effort to accelerate the education of gifted students (especially when full academic credit is given for courses covered only by such examinations), and in part an effort to place students in courses where they will profit most. Comparatively little screening of this type is currently undertaken by departments of Speech, but it is an avenue to explore, not only for the objectives stated above, but also as a means of more efficiently utilizing teacher and student time.

4. Departments of Speech not only serve their majors and the needs of terminal students; they frequently function as service departments, offering special courses for other fields, schools, or colleges. Here again the tendency to proliferate is apparent, this time encouraged or requested by outsiders, and we may offer such courses as "Speech for Teachers," "Speech for Lawyers," "Speech for Engineers," and "Speech for Business." In some cases, to be sure, such specialized treatments of particular problems in oral communication may be merited, but more often, I suspect, we are offering the same course under a variety of names. If we face the prospect of stretching our available resources, may not one approach be to consolidate as many as possible of these special-interest courses into a common mold?

Finally, the Council sessions gave some attention to questions of optimum class size, use of audio-visual aids, teaching load, equation of curricular and extra-curricular assignments, and the most efficient—and educationally sound—employment of graduate assistants and teaching fellows. These topics may suggest additional avenues of exploration for some departments of Speech in their search for more efficient ways to utilize staff resources.

J. Jeffery Auer,
University of Virginia

NEW BOOKS IN REVIEW

LELAND M. GRIFFIN, *Editor*

RECENT LITERARY CRITICISM

Don Geiger

Only the gloomiest reader thinks of the modern literary period as solely a time of Frost. Most of us include Yeats, Eliot, Richards, Hulme, Ransom, Tate: fill out with a fairly long paragraph of names. But we can best assess the most recent literary criticism, I think, if we understand that there are now a number of "workers in the vineyard" for whom the writings of the moderns constitute an *inheritance*. (What must we call these? I hope not "newer" critics and "post-moderns.")

If the change in literary direction has not attracted much attention, it is probably because of the sympathy with which our most recent writers have regarded the bequest of their immediate predecessors (I think of Mr. Ciardi's remark that the poetry of Pound, et al., has left "succeeding poets with a stock of techniques richer and more varied than any that had earlier been available to American writers.") The situation was very different for the "moderns" of the 1920's. No one could doubt that a revolution was taking place: it was announced on the hour, with revolution putting out revolution in an almost daily double play, Imagism to Vorticism to BLAST. When Mr. Pound and Mr. Eliot "took over" the literary shop, they purported to find at creaking machines only a few infirm old men whom they didn't even trouble to dismiss, reserving most of their anger for the upstairs portraits of the former managers, Shelley, Wordsworth, and Milton—with their difference in opinion hardly saving Dryden's image from a comic moustache.

He who lives by the sword, if he is strong enough, may die in bed in peace, and if the between-Wars modern is sinking, he apparently does so in the arms of affectionate nephews. But I do not mean to imply their fawning or uncritical regard. Mr. Ciardi's above-quoted remark was made, after all, in his collection of *Mid-Century American Poets* whom he rather clearly presented as different in their collectivity from the earlier moderns. Nor was an implied criticism wanting in Mr. Ciardi's rhetorical question: "Can the poet address himself to that notion of the civilized man, or must he think only of the literary specialist? Must he forever be Mr. Eliot writing for Mr. Pound and Mr. Pound writing for Mr. Eliot?"

Of course no one really believes that Mr. Pound's audience should be, or has been, restricted to one. His criticism has received a very wide reading and the recently published *Literary Essays of Ezra Pound*, edited (one must say, of course) by T. S. Eliot, will hardly cause a reappraisal of Mr. Pound. He is much too current a topic for that, and the chief value of the book is

Don Geiger (Ph.D., Northwestern University, 1951) is Associate Professor of Speech at the University of California, Berkeley. Professor Geiger is the editor of *Western Speech*.

doubtless that it brings Pound's criticism in a single package to an audience which has already been secured and is even now conducting its "agonizing" appraisal. Nor can I do more than hint at the possibilities for such appraisal here: how his interest in and use of foreign literatures preceded by twenty-five years our growing national awareness of existence in a world community; or how—to look at the same fact of "expatriation" with greater skepticism—he nailed up his exotic poetical finds in *Poetry* magazine in rather the manner of other globe-trotting Americans of the period who flashed photographs of their "trip abroad" to humble the poor clodhoppers back home.

The single example may suggest a view of Pound as both quack and genius—a somewhat general view (except to those who insist he is solely one or the other) which I am pleased to accept as a *starting point* for evaluating his work. Closer inspection will reveal the quackery to be of two sorts. Perhaps the most forgivable huckstering lies in Pound's fighting a commercial age with the techniques of commercialism—so that his various "movements," poetics, and pronouncements seem more frequently directed to trumpeting out an audience for his latest enthusiasm than they seem descriptive of literary facts. But in this case the advertising man is working for a good product. There is at least something splendid (and I fear not altogether usual) in a critic's wanting his reader to read also the book that's being criticized, and I think there can be no doubt that this is Pound's intention.

Another sort of quackery lies in Pound's personal manner—and even this only more baldly expresses a self-gratulation which is hardly unique with Pound, or poets. At his egregious worst Pound sits there, loving the Report Card which he made out himself, catcalling, "I can read faster and better than any of *you* guys!" At his best he has, with real devotion to his art, made available for other poets a formidable magazine of creative procedures.

Perhaps the most important single fact of Pound is that he has truly *cared* for language and literature. Speaking of literature's social function (and I shall leave it to the professors of Public Address to evaluate the moral importance of his view in an Age of the Big Lie), Pound says that it "is *not* coercing or emotionally persuading, or bullying or suppressing people into the acceptance of any one set or any six sets of opinions" but that "it has to do with the clarity and vigour of 'any and every' thought and opinion. It has to do with maintaining the very cleanliness of the tools, the health of the very matter of thought itself. . . . the individual cannot think and communicate his thought, the governor and legislator cannot act effectively or frame his laws, without words, and the solidity and validity of these words is in the care of the damned and despised *literati*. When their work goes rotten, . . . (when) the application of word to thing goes rotten . . . the whole machinery of social and of individual thought and order goes to pot."

This is Pound speaking, but the grand view of the matter belongs to the age of which he was "high priest," and it is little wonder that more recent writers accept the vision gratefully. What causes, then, above the public smile of the younger men, the occasional frown of anxiety—articulated in remarks like those of Mr. Ciardi, or in considerations like Mr. Jarrell's a couple of years ago of modern criticism, in which he concluded that there is just too much of it, or in Mr. Shapiro's

even more desperate recent comment that modern criticism has nearly "killed off" the audience for poetry?

I think that one answer to the question may be derived from a sympathetic reading of Murray Krieger's *The New Apologists for Poetry*. Mr. Krieger studies the creative process, the aesthetic object, and the function of poetry (in which he stresses poetry's cognitive possibilities) through an analysis of the relevant aspects of the criticism of Hulme, Eliot, Richards, D. G. James, Winters, Brooks, etc. His publishers report accurately that Mr. Krieger's "purpose is to clear the ground for a systematic aesthetics of poetry consistent with the insights of our most influential contemporary literary critics." Clear the ground indeed! Mr. Krieger, trampling through the last thirty years of critical writings, frequently gives the appearance of a wounded Marine lost in the Burma jungles, "bloody at the back but gutty to the end." I present my image not to denigrate Mr. Krieger's work but to evoke the luxurious confusion of the critical period which he so excellently treats. Mr. Krieger says bluntly of "the so-called 'new criticism'" that the "literary critics whom we usually include in that amorphous group would seem, upon close examination, to have little enough in common—too little, perhaps, to justify making a school of them."

A terrible gloom must descend over the soul of the scholar who agrees (as he ought) with Mr. Krieger: before all those books and all those new critics can be dismissed, they must be read! It is Mr. Krieger's wonderful virtue that he *has* read them. He has read them sympathetically, convinced that they have contributed a richness to literary theory, and though hardly a critic gets through Mr. Krieger's rigorous analysis without some sharp raps, I think they must feel that their positions have been fairly and accurately reported by Mr. Krieger.

To say so much is perhaps to discover one reason for the uneasy appreciation of their predecessors' criticism by poet-critics like Ciardi, Jarrell, and Shapiro. Twenty-five years ago the "sensitive amateur" in aesthetics (and what poet would wish to claim professionalism in these matters?) could feel himself perfectly competent to make a contribution to literary theory. Certain *Southern Review* papers of the 1930's, when the "new criticism" had already become a squadron pennant, very frankly suggested that the really new thing in the "new criticism" was that it *was* criticism. It is old news now: that the literary professors of the period tried to know everything *about* the literary work, leaving its aesthetic structure to the Sunday book reviewers. A doubtless excessive statement of the case it was sufficiently just to provide a rationale for a kind of suggestive or evocative theorizing by the critics and poet-critics.

The final value of Mr. Krieger's book, as I apprehend it, is to suggest two things: how *splendidly* suggestive were the poet-critics and critics of the period between the Wars, and how *merely* suggestive they were, too. If this is a proper view of the matter, it means that something other than sensitive amateurism is now required to advance literary theory. I think what is required is to be found in books like Mr. Wimsatt's *The Verbal Icon* and this one by Mr. Krieger—works that endlessly modify, closely define and delimit, tortuously trace out the furthest implications of an idea. That is not entirely good news for the reading public: stylistically good images, the fighting stance, the witty remark are replaced in this lat-

est theory by highly abstract, almost toneless speculation—so that a logical positivist might happily get twenty pages or so into Mr. Krieger or Mr. Wimsatt before learning that he isn't reading mathematical signs.

A more graceful stylist among literary theorists is Mr. Eliseo Vivas whose *Creation and Discovery* represents a selection from the works written by Vivas over the last quarter of a century. Mr. Vivas' papers have been among the most stimulating which have appeared in this period, and it is very good to have them assembled for ready reference and a wider audience. Mr. Krieger, in the preface to his own volume, in honoring his personal debt to Mr. Vivas speaks well of his accomplishment: "he has taught me never to forget the crucial relevance and intimate relationship of aesthetics to all matters of literary theory." In his newly published volume, Mr. Vivas includes sections of literary criticism and comments on various aesthetic theories, but the special values of the volume will surely be found in the middle sections which deal with Problems of Aesthetics and Theory of Criticism. In this space I simply cannot suggest the superior value of the book, but I can at least briefly quote Mr. Vivas. In his good essay, "What is a Poem?" for example, this definition: "A poem is a linguistic artifact, whose function is to organize the primary data of experience that can be exhibited in and through words." It seems to me about as good a definition as we can get, with the "in and through" particularly providing some problems which Mr. Vivas deals with about as well as we can imagine their being dealt with (that is, proving something just this side of our complete satisfaction). In his cool discussion of the vexing question of literature and knowledge, he concludes, "In the narrow sense of the word, literature does not give us knowledge, since it does not give us a picture of which we may demand correspondence with the actual world as we actually grasp it. It gives us an aesthetically ordered picture. But life seldom achieves the order that a work of literature possesses; and when it does, it does so only by happy accident. But if literature does not give us knowledge, it ought to be recognized that it is prior in the order of logic to all knowledge, since it is constitutive of culture, which is one of the conditions of knowledge." And on the problem of intrinsic and extrinsic criticism: "There is a proper time at which to bring to bear on the reader's mind the extrinsic resources necessary for reading of the poem. That time is when the reader is preparing himself to read a poem by enlarging his funded experience. . . . During his reading of the poem he should stay inside of it, if he is interested in poetry and not in something else. Not to encourage him to stay inside the poem is to cheat him of what the poem can do for him as poetry—and that is something for which no substitute can be found in human culture." Only Mr. Vivas' book can reveal the subtlety and penetration with which he (usually) develops views like these. But I hope that these brief quotations will be sufficient to suggest how *sensible* are the convictions in which his subtlety is based.

In my zeal to suggest the emergence of a new literary period I have perhaps wrongly presented the early moderns as "museum pieces." If so, Sister M. Bernetta Quinn's volume, *The Metamorphic Tradition in Modern Poetry*, will provide a proper corrective. Sister Bernetta's volume is a collection of essays on the poetry of Pound, Stevens, Williams, Eliot, Crane, Randall Jarrell,

and Yeats. She suggests that her book endeavors "to show that to write a poem is in itself to effect a metamorphosis, and that the process has been so treated by modern theorists whose practice is herein discussed." Sister Bernetta makes use of a number of definitions for her major term but concludes that "All of these senses, however, can perhaps be grouped . . . 'a striking alteration in appearance, character, or circumstances.'" Her particular view provides her with a way into the poetry, and we need not be overly critical of it, though given such a definition any metaphor in any poem in any age is in effect a "metamorphosis" of sorts, and the term does not provide for an acute delimitation of modern works (not entirely true: Stevens' work can be seen profitably, and is so seen by Sister Bernetta, as thematically rooted in the question of metamorphosis, and in that sense the term becomes useful as a critical term).

But I do not wish to seem to be quibbling with a collection of essays which I admire. At the back of her volume are twenty-seven pages of bibliography, many of them consisting of titles about the works and authors that comprise her subject. It is the kind of bibliography which makes the weary critic ask, "You mean there's something more to say?" and the real value of Sister Bernetta's book is that, after you have read it, you can answer, "Yes." She has approached her poets alertly but sympathetically, clearly assuming that their reputations are rooted in achievement, and her book helps make their achievements even more accessible to us.

One might hope that a book like Sister Bernetta's would fall into the hands of Mr. Stanton Coblentz on a day when all the omens are favorable. I am afraid, however, that Mr. Coblentz has so long pursued his hatred of the moderns that it has become a vested interest. In his little volume *The Rise of the Anti-Poets* Mr. Coblentz suggests that modern poets have nothing to express and write only to attract attention to themselves. I am afraid that one can only say with Troilus, "Hector is dead. There is no more to say."

Miss Louise Bogan's *Selected Criticism* is not very helpful either in increasing our understanding of modern literature, but for entirely different reasons. This book, by and large, simply is *not* a book of criticism. It is, as Miss Bogan states in her introduction, a collection of book reviews, short little pieces on writers which Miss Bogan has contributed to the magazines during the past thirty years. A number of readers must have wriggled uncomfortably before this collection. Miss Bogan is doubtless a splendid reviewer. Our sense of the general "rightness" of her opinions is only increased as we try to recall the various years in which she uttered the various remarks collected here. But the collection, in 1956, can hardly stand up against the weight of criticism now trailing the various authors she has reviewed. What are we to say, for example, of a page and a half on Hart Crane which concludes, "Crane was a poet of genius whose untimely death was a certain loss to American literature"? Well, this then, of the whole book: these are excellent reviews, their publication is a proper tribute to Miss Bogan's accomplishment as a poet and to her stature as a literary professional; read rapidly they provide an interesting sense of a vigorous and fertile period, and in their totality they reveal the writer to be a person who is just, decent, and frequently wise. On the assumption that acquaintance with such a person

justifies the publication of any book, we can be grateful that this one is now in print.

I must deal much more briefly than I like with F. R. Leavis' book-length study of Lawrence, *D. H. Lawrence: Novelist*. Of all the "kinds" of critics Mr. Leavis is, I think, the best kind, certainly the most *healthful* kind: a critic who reminds us that reading books can be a distinguished human activity. He is also the kind of critic who may terrorize the creative writer: Mr. Leavis plunges into the writer's world and lives in every sentence of it. Whenever Mr. Leavis comes across a sentence in which he cannot live satisfactorily, woe to the writer! This is, in my opinion, reading as it should be, and despite the poet's fear of it, the kind of reading he must really welcome as a little miracle of comprehension. However that may be, Lawrence would not need to fear Mr. Leavis whose design is to show that Lawrence is "the great writer of our own phase of civilization." The great value of Mr. Leavis' book is that, even if you do not quite believe his major premise, his book will drive you back to Lawrence.

There are many incidental virtues in Mr. Leavis' reading: he gives us quite an interesting record of literary power-politics in the period (though his awareness of that combined with his desire to exalt Lawrence makes him sometimes treat Lawrence as though he has been dismissed and forgotten—hardly my impression, at least, of the facts). Also it will interest some readers to discover that, however easy it was for Mr. Eliot to separate poetry and belief in poets whom he admired, it proved plainly impossible for him to separate literary achievement and belief in Lawrence, whose ideas he detested.

C. M. Bowra's *Inspiration and Poetry* is criticism of a very different sort. The ordinary critic of our day somehow suggests the impression that he is feverishly writing on the kitchen table while his children are roller-skating round the linoleum and his nostrils fill with the musky odor of laundry drying in the basement. Bowra's work just as surely gives the impression of a man who has prodigiously made the intellectual most of ample leisure.

This book is a collection of papers on Horace, Dante, Daniel, Milton, Pushkin, Lermontov, Pater, and others. Unlike Mr. Leavis, Sir Maurice does not get inside anybody else's skin but stays quite securely in his own. It is surely an admirable place to be: there is something really breath-taking in sentences like this one, "Hardy was no Palladas or Leopardi or James Thomson." The Ages, one feels, are somehow all equally there for this man of large learning, and the "schools" and "approaches" dissolve in his total regard for literature, as he slides from biographical comment to close criticism to a consideration of the social context, etc.

Bowra doesn't deal with any of his authors as sensitively and acutely as Leavis does with D. H. Lawrence; I suspect that he would wither quickly in a theoretical discussion with Vivas. But his learning and universality of literary interest provide another kind of distinguished critical model.

I must very rapidly deal with the remaining books on this list. Mr. Henry W. Wells' *Poet and Psychiatrist* is a very welcome study of Merrill Moore, both as poet and psychiatrist, with the stress falling on the poetry. It is regrettable that, in his attempt to bolster Moore's poetic reputation, Mr. Wells has seen fit to minimize the work of Tate, Warren, Ransom, Crane, etc. But Mr. Wells does not harp much on this and so

neither need we. Moore is simply not the poet that these other men are, but he is a good one, deserves a critical portrait, and here is a competently drawn one.

Willard Burdett Arnold's little volume, *The Social Ideas of Allen Tate,* gives these ideas in a somewhat capsule form. However, although Mr. Arnold sometimes treats quite complex ideas with an insufficient simplicity, this book makes a good introduction to Tate and the Agrarians (who, it must also be said, sometimes treated simple ideas with an unnecessary complexity).

The Borestone Mountain *Poetry Awards 1955* is "a compilation of original poetry published in magazines of the English-speaking world in 1954." This is the seventh volume in the series and hardly anyone will agree that the prize-winners actually wrote the best poems that year, but that doubtless would have been the case no matter who had been selected. In any event, whatever one thinks of this particular sampling of magazine verse, it is hardly possible to think of a better critical act than that of actually packaging some poems. In this belief, I should like Mr. Krieger to put *my* last word: "Despite the insecurities of the self-conscious theorist, perhaps poetry after all asks not to be apologized for but only to be read."

BOOKS REVIEWED

Literary Essays of Ezra Pound. Edited by T. S. Eliot. Norfolk, Connecticut: New Directions, 1955; pp. xv+464. $6.00.

The New Apologists for Poetry. By Murray Krieger. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1956; pp. xiv+225. $4.00.

Creation and Discovery. By Eliseo Vivas. New York: The Noonday Press, 1955; pp. xiv+306. $5.00.

The Metamorphic Tradition in Modern Poetry. By Sister M. Bernetta Quinn. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1955; pp. 263. $4.50.

The Rise of the Anti-Poets. By Stanton Coblentz. Mill Valley, California: The Wings Press, 1955; pp. 95. $2.00.

Selected Criticism. By Louise Bogan. New York: The Noonday Press, 1955; pp. 404. $4.50.

D. H. Lawrence: Novelist. By F. R. Leavis. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956; pp. xiv+393. $4.75.

Inspiration and Poetry. By C. M. Bowra. London: MacMillan & Co. Ltd., 1955; pp. vi+266. $4.25.

Poet and Psychiatrist: A Critical Portrait of Merrill Moore, M. D. By Henry W. Wells. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1955; pp. 325. $5.00.

The Social Ideas of Allen Tate. By Willard Burdett Arnold. Boston: Bruce Humphries, 1955; pp. 64. $2.75.

Borestone Mountain Poetry Awards 1955. Edited by Robert T. Moore. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1955; pp. xii+115. $3.00.

LOGIC AND RHETORIC IN ENGLAND, 1500-1700. By Wilbur Samuel Howell. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1956; pp. vii+411. $6.00.

Until the publication of the work now under consideration, there has been no comprehensive, thorough, historical study of the theory of public address. C. S. Baldwin's *Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic* and his subsequent treatments of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, important as they were as pioneer works, lacked comprehensiveness, and they retained the rhetoric-poetic focus which became progressively less relevant to the arts of non-poetic communication as one book followed the other. Various important historical studies of rhetorics and rhetoricians have appeared, including two by Professor Howell, but none until now has had the scope permitting broad historical treatment.

In previous publications Professor Howell has made crucial contributions to rhetorical history, characterized by sound, careful learning and primary concern with rhetoric not as the corollary or adjunct of poetic only, but as the theory of public address. His translation of Nathaniel Carpenter's essay on logic and rhetoric, in the first issue of *Speech Monographs* (1934), directed attention to one of the major problems of the present history. In the introduction to his translation of the Latin *Rhetoric of Alcuin and Charlemagne* (1941) he illumined the medieval background of English rhetoric and dialectic as well as the central Roman rhetorical doctrine of *status,* or the "positions" of argument. With his subsequent translation of Fénelon's *Dialogues on Eloquence* (1951) he offered the first adequate analysis of the reforms of Ramus and of the implications of the Ramian-Talaean rhetoric, preliminary to a sketch

of the "new" rhetoric being born in the seventeenth century. Most recently his introductory chapter in the SAA's *History of Speech Education in America* gave an appetizing foretaste of the present volume.

In *Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700*, Professor Howell analyzes, classifies, and explains historically all the works on logic and rhetoric which had currency or significance in England to 1700. There emerges a pattern of historical development in the theory of communication which corresponds to the larger movement of ideas and to the changing needs of the times. "A theory of communication," it becomes clear, "is an organic part of a culture" (p. 9).

One aspect of the theory of communication, the theory of poetry, lies partly outside his purpose, but only so far as that theory was distinct from logic and rhetoric, for "Englishmen of those two centuries did not waste their time in the vain effort to deny to poetry a primarily communicative function" (p. 4). Rhetoric, of course, comprehended much that is relevant to poetry: the figures of speech, for example, and the principles of writing speeches for drama and epic. Hence in most histories of literary criticism, such as those of the late J. W. H. Atkins, rhetoric figures prominently in the theory of literature. Furthermore, because the rhetorical education of writers and readers had an appreciable effect, during the Renaissance at least, on the composition and reception of literary works, Renaissance studies of late have turned to rhetoric as one avenue to the understanding and interpretation of literary phenomena.

To the history of literary theory in its broadest sense, Howell contributes the parallel and integrated consideration of logic and rhetoric, or more broadly the history of the theory of authorship, for a very important two centuries. This obvious but neglected reconsideration of rhetoric as the "counterpart of dialectic," has brought order out of apparent chaos. It has reunited co-ordinate arts which ignorance or misapprehension had long kept asunder; it has made sense out of what had appeared to be whimsical aberrations and unaccountable distortions in the theory of discourse; it has righted an imbalance in critical history which for generations had made bitter conflict out of simple dichotomy. On almost every page Professor Howell has resolved some confusion which had been crying for clarification, or revealed some insight which had been awaiting the perspective of a scholar of his equipment.

The historical pattern of logic and rhetoric from 1500 to 1700 which emerges may be described as "first an accepted tradition, then a reform, then a counterreform, and finally a resultant new tradition" (p. 6). The book is organized so as to emphasize that pattern. First is considered the traditional logic, derived from Aristotle and his commentators, with chief attention to Thomas Wilson's *Rule of Reason*. This, using a term employed by some of the writers themselves, Howell calls "Scholastic Logic." Parallel to the scholastic logic, and second to be treated, is "Traditional" rhetoric, which appears in three forms: the "Ciceronian," which recognizes and often treats the "five great arts" of Cicero and Quintilian; the "stylistic," which, often recognizing the five arts, treats only style, with emphasis on the tropes and figures; and the "formulary," which seeks to teach the arts of communication through models of discourse rather than principles and precepts. After two exhaustive chapters on the works embodying and modifying the accepted tradition, such as Wilson's *Rhetorique* and Sherry's *Treatise of Schemes and Tropes*, Howell turns to reform in his central and longest chapter, on "The English Ramists." Here he develops fully the analysis of Ramus' reform of dialectic and rhetoric which he had begun in the introduction to his translation of Fénelon, and the account of the triumph of Ramian-Talaean logic-rhetoric in England which is sketched in his chapter in the *History of Speech Education in America*. Chapter 5 details the revival of opposition to the phenomenal monopoly which Ramus had secured over English logic and rhetoric. Here Howell explores the "systematics," who tended to return to Aristotle's ten categories in logic, and the "Neo-Ciceronians," who tended to put certain aspects of invention and arrangement back into rhetoric, for example Vicars, Farnaby, and, of course, Puttenham and Hoskins. In the final chapter Howell scans the "New Horizons in Logic and Rhetoric" presented by the reforms of Descartes and the Port-Royalists in logic, and by the new views of Bacon, Lamy, Hobbes, and Glanvill in rhetoric. The theory of communication begins to show changes in keeping with the emergence of the scientific outlook in learning and with the needs of a society of more broadly diffused culture and increasing middle-class preoccupations. Logic begins to concentrate on discovery and verification rather than disputation. In rhetoric the "artistic" topics or places of invention give way to the "inartistic" reliance on investiga-

tion and evidence; and the *elocutio* of tropes and figures yields to the neo-Aristotelian-Royal-Society criteria of perspicuity and propriety. A rhetoric of use to an older society had declined into a rhetoric of exhibition and ostentation. It had to be brought back again to use.

The principal virtues of Howell's work, beyond the thoroughness of his scholarship and the abundance of his firsthand information, derive from his point of view and the perspective which it enables his reader to maintain. If, for example, one looks facilely at logic as a theory of thought and rhetoric as a theory of expression, then some of the very confined and refined rhetorics of the Renaissance and seventeenth century perhaps deserve the severe strictures often cast upon them for their "thoughtlessness." If, however, one realizes, as one must now that Howell has done his work, that until modern times logic was not intended to be the art of thinking but the art of disputing, that the *places* served not for the discovery of new truth but for referring new cases to old truths, then one sees that logic also was an art of expression. Thus logic and rhetoric are seen, in the symbol of Zeno's closed fist and open hand, as complementary arts of discourse, the one of learned disputation, the other of popular elaboration. This perspective is missing from Sanford's pioneer study of English rhetorics, and hence the many contradictions in that useful work. With the perspective which Howell establishes, however, even the radical separation of invention and disposition from style and delivery effected by Ramus takes on a reasonableness which goes far to explain the popularity of Ramian doctrines for most of a century. More than mere neatness justified the logic-rhetoric division, for both were assumed to be necessary phases of the whole art of discourse.

From Howell's point of view also the decline of Ramism and the beginning of a logic of investigation only secondarily directed at communication, and of a rhetoric depending on fact and observation and on a style adapted to the common listener appear as consequences of known antecedents and corollaries of changing times. Tendencies were emerging, however, which Howell's scope permits him to identify but not to pursue. If the rise and decline of Ramism appear to be the striking features of the tale Howell has to tell, the divergence of science and the theory of communication seems to be the theme of the story which his history foretells.

Professor Howell provides copious annotation, full bibliographical description for all the rare works cited, and a useful index of names and topics. If this reader were to find fault, perhaps it would be the pleasant rhetorical fault of too frequent recapitulation. He finds nothing, however, to qualify the opinion that in *Logic and Rhetoric in England, 1500-1700*, rhetorical history is born in full scholarly maturity.

DONALD C. BRYANT,
Washington University

THE AMERICAN LYCEUM: TOWN MEETING OF THE MIND. By Carl Bode. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956; pp. xxi+275. $5.00.

In this book Carl Bode presents the first comprehensive view of lecturing and the lyceum prior to 1860. Previously the story of this popular movement, which at one time could boast of 3,000 branches, was told only in magazine articles and monographs. Consequently, in collecting material for the book, Bode had to do exhaustive and painstaking combing of remote sources widely scattered. The book represents a substantial job of research.

The book falls roughly into two parts. The first half considers the lyceum from its beginning until 1845, the period when the institution was devoted primarily to adult popular education with emphasis upon popular science. The second half discusses the years from 1845 to 1860 when most groups became lecture-forums. Within each half the author traces the growth of the movement from section to section, discussing the important village and city lyceums in each state. In each half, he includes what he calls "platform galleries," brief biographical sketches of leading performers. Furthermore, he relates the institution to the development of public education, literature, and the library. The author has also included a brief but valuable section on bibliographical information.

The lyceum as an adult education movement was another manifestation of the democratic upsurge which has been called the rise of the common man. The weekly meetings became an effective means of supplementing the meager offerings of the common school. The lecturers, who included some great names of the day, brought to thousands of persons stimulating thoughts on a wide variety of subjects, including religion, philosophy, literature, travel, science, and the fine arts. The greatest contribution was made on the local level. Bode shows that

the county and state groups really achieved little and were never fully represented at annual meetings of the American Lyceum, the national group. Much of the desire for self-improvement waned after 1845, and the members then looked to the lyceum more for entertainment than for improvement.

The movement was strongest in New England and New York and weakest in the South. Josiah Holbrook was clearly the guiding and moving spirit, personally helping to organize hundreds of local groups. He devoted much of his time to lecturing and writing about the philosophy and importance of the lyceum idea.

In the opinion of this reviewer, the book suffers from over-organization and inadequate synthesis; consequently, the reader is likely to become confused as the author moves from town to town and at the same time attempts to relate his discussion to the developments in general education, population trends, transportation and the westward moving frontier. At times the author's generalizations seem too sweeping and too inclusive.

Nevertheless, this book contributes much to our understanding of the pre-Civil War period and particularly lecturing and lecturers. It is especially valuable to the teacher of the history of American oratory, of literature, and of American civilization.

WALDO W. BRADEN,
Louisiana State University

THE LIFE OF MATTHEW SIMPSON. By Robert D. Clark. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1956; pp. xi+344. $5.50.

Matthew Simpson, itinerant Methodist, Allegheny College professor, first president of Indiana Asbury (now DePauw), editor of the *Western Christian Advocate*, bishop, and "high priest" of Radical Republicans, at last has a biography worthy of his achievements. A brilliant rhetorical study, this volume also ably records social, political, and religious history, with vivid accounts of life on the Old Northwestern Frontier, the up-by-the-bootstraps rise of Methodism, bitter in-fighting among ecclesiastics, sordid middle-period politics, and the role of oratory as a major force in nineteenth-century society.

Simpson, a real-life Horatio Alger of the ministry, achieved success through eloquence, a by-product of his intensive study. At seventeen, he walked ninety miles over mountain roads to enter Madison College at Uniontown, Pennsylvania, for his only formal education. Returning to his home in Cadiz, Ohio, with a tutorship after a single semester, the young scholar gave up college to study medicine under the supervision of a doctor in a nearby community. After three years of Gibson's *Surgery*, Good's *Study of Medicine*, Hufeland's *Treatise on the Scrofulous Disease*, and Dewees's *A Compendious System of Midwifery*, he was "called to preach." Renouncing his medical practice, he became a Methodist itinerant on a six weeks' circuit with thirty-four appointments at a salary (when he could collect it) of $100 a year, a dedicated "challenger of nature's wilderness and man's unbelief."

There followed rapid advancement to a city parish; then an Allegheny professorship in science; and, at twenty-eight, the presidency of Indiana Asbury. Biographer Robert D. Clark, Chairman of the Department of Speech and Acting Dean at the University of Oregon, describes Simpson's rhetorical career from his timid, awkward, nervous youth to his lofty station as "the most eloquent preacher in Methodism." Following the Wesleyan practice of daily study, Simpson rose between four and five each morning and read diligently until ten, a regimen which eventually enabled him to overcome "the fear of failure, of moving lips that could not speak."

As Simpson achieved power and success in a worldly sense, so did Methodism. Indeed, the scholarly onetime itinerant contributed greatly to the increasing sophistication of his church by championing seminaries for preachers, learning for communicants, and an improved church architecture and music. Under his skillful guidance, Methodism changed from an anti-intellectual denomination to one which encouraged learning, and from a church of the humble to one which included many of the nation's mighty.

Simpson's success was reflected in important roles as public orator and as confidant to presidents and business tycoons. His persuasive voice helped mobilize the Deity behind Northern legions in the Civil War, influenced Lincoln and Grant in making appointments, and contributed to the sentiment which brought President Andrew Johnson to impeachment. The day after Lincoln's Second Inaugural, the Bishop brought tears to the President's "bronzed cheeks" with a dramatic sermon on "the most terrible of all wars." A little over a month later, he delivered the Emancipator's funeral sermon.

As a good biographer should, Professor Clark describes Simpson "wart and all" without apology or condemnation. Unfortunately for

what the late James G. Randall called the "blundering generation," the Bishop was "no Amos," but rather a "eulogist for country and church." For all his scholarship, this successful spokesman of Methodism failed to rise above the vindictiveness of the "bloody shirt," the materialism of the Gilded Age, and the chauvinism of Manifest Destiny. In spite of these concessions to his times, however, Simpson did encourage liberal attitudes toward women's rights, temperance, the dissemination of knowledge, and the "utilization of the findings of science" in theology. His enlightened position on these latter questions rightly places him as a forerunner of "present-day liberals of the Methodist church."

An extremely readable biography, *Matthew Simpson* is also scholarly and urbane, befitting its subject, the great intellectual of nineteenth-century Methodism.

ROBERT GRAY GUNDERSON,
Oberlin College

EDEN: THE MAKING OF A STATESMAN. By Alan Campbell-Johnson. New York: Ives Washburn, Inc., 1955; pp. xiv+306. $5.00.

ANTHONY EDEN: THE CHRONICLE OF A CAREER. By Lewis Broad. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1955; pp. viii+280. $5.00.

PORTRAIT OF A STATESMAN. By Dennis Bardens. London: Frederick Muller Ltd., 1955; pp. 326. 21s.

At least since 1942, Anthony Eden has seemed the Conservative most likely to succeed Winston Churchill to party and national leadership; yet, when he was designated Prime Minister on April 6, 1955, he had been the subject of only one book-length study. By the end of 1955, the three biographies listed above had been published in England. Each gives some evidence of having been prepared in haste for each is dull and repetitious in spots and each is based almost entirely on common knowledge and the public record.

No one of these volumes is markedly superior to the others in coverage or in political or character analysis; each pretends only to provide a useful interim report on the life and prospects of the new Prime Minister. For most readers it will be enough to own *one* of these works. Which, will be largely a matter of interests and personal tastes. Campbell-Johnson has supplied the fullest detail, especially where Eden's speeches and other public pronouncements are concerned. Broad's account is addressed to "the curiosity existing in the United States of America about the personality of the Prime Minister of Great Britain." In a style more interesting than Campbell-Johnson's, it furnishes much detail and some assessment of Eden's character and promise as a national leader. Dennis Bardens has also undertaken to interpret as well as to report Eden's life and work; he manages the facts of Sir Anthony's career more selectively than either of his fellow biographers and comes nearer to portraying a man rather than an official only. These are friendly studies and, at the time of this writing, they are the only recent biographies of Eden available in English. I prefer Lewis Broad's work for its ample coverage of events, its significant though incidental criticism of speeches and speaking, and its moderately lively style. Readers not specifically interested in rhetorical criticism will probably place a higher value on Bardens' fuller characterization of Eden as a man. Timetable fanciers will find Campbell-Johnson's revision of his 1939 biography to their tastes.

It is striking that Eden's biographers should agree so closely in their estimates of his character and his career. Perhaps the reason is that these are journalistic biographies, or perhaps the reason is that the Eden the world yet knows is the creature of the dispatch case and the conference communique. In any case the figure emerging from each of these studies is a remarkably skillful negotiator and administrator, driven by intense ambition yet self-effacing and, usually, completely self-controlled. Amazing industry, keenness of mind, scrupulous honesty, courageousness, unswerving loyalty, and an idealism hard to describe or bound precisely are his virtues. On the other hand he is a figure who has, either by the fortunes of position or by eschewing firm policy commitments, avoided almost all important political controversy in a most controversial age (even his resignation from the Chamberlain Government in 1938 seems to have resulted as much from disagreements over timing and procedure in negotiations with Italy as from any fundamental disagreement on objectives in foreign policy). Campbell-Johnson and Broad suggest that Eden touched the imagination of his fellow Conservatives when, in October 1945, he proposed as their peacetime political goal "a nation-wide property-owning democracy"; but this is as near to an original political concept as friendly biographers can bring his name.

"Most people, asked to list his positive achievements, would find themselves in considerable difficulty," writes Dennis Bardens. Eden's biographers are no exceptions to the rule. Is a new, more imaginative, more philosophical Eden about to step from behind the wall of diplomatic restraint and out of the shadow of the incomparable Churchill? This is the riddle his biographers would like to have answered but have not; nor have events in 1956 given many new clues to history's final judgment. Despite the optimistic titles Campbell-Johnson and Bardens gave their studies, no *statesman* emerges from their volumes. It still remains to be seen whether Broad's more precise phrase, "The Chronicle of a Career," must always be the proper description of biographical treatises on Sir Anthony Eden.

Readers of this journal will derive satisfaction from the amount and quality of rhetorical analysis and criticism they will find in the three volumes under discussion. Broad and Campbell-Johnson insist that Eden's speeches in Opposition, between 1945 and 1951, gave the Conservative Party important proof that their artist of diplomacy could also marshall the probabilities of domestic and imperial topics in calm, cogent argument. His special abilities as a speaker before the television camera also receive attention from each biographer. Those in this country who heard *and saw* the Prime Minister's February 2, 1956, address to the American people will readily understand why it may be said that through this medium his personal charm and sincerity, so admired by his intimates and constituents, first became evident to millions. But whoever has sampled the three volumes of his published speeches (*Foreign Affairs*, 1939; *Freedom and Order*, 1948; *Days for Decision*, 1949) will also agree with Bardens that "he is without rhetoric," with Campbell-Johnson that he has great need to "rise above his own expertise," and with Broad that "the prepared speech has been Eden's enemy." With the most important question in rhetorical criticism each biographer has struggled unsuccessfully: Are there stored in the mind of the new Prime Minister those clearly defined principles of action, those humane objectives of policy, and that fund of judgments on the meanings of experience, which are indispensable to a true rhetoric of democratic leadership? This is, of course, but another way of asking whether Eden's long apprenticeship was a segment of a prominent career or the making of a statesman, a question which puzzles Sir Anthony's biographers—and this reviewer.

Issues, actions, speeches, and historical events, as well as persons and places, are thoroughly indexed in each of these works. Since the volumes are most valuable as reportorial accounts, this is a special convenience.

CARROLL C. ARNOLD,
Cornell University

REPRESENTATIVE AMERICAN SPEECHES: 1954-1955. Edited by A. Craig Baird. New York: The H. W. Wilson Company, 1955; pp. 190. $1.50.

In editing *Representative American Speeches: 1954-1955*, the eighteenth in this annual series, Professor Baird has continued the high scholarly standards set much earlier with the initial volume. The student of speechmaking and the diligent researcher cannot quarrel with Baird's basic assumption that the selected speakers delivered thoughtful ideas that had more than passing significance, that speechmaking is to be evaluated in terms of audience response, and that the included speakers have influenced to some extent the many trends of the times.

Professor Baird validly asserts that one of the best ways to study the American attitude and mind is to examine contemporary speechmaking in social context. The present Introduction cogently identifies selected economic, political, social, and religious movements of the period and indicates the relation of the speeches to those events and trends.

He does an excellent job of discussing a twofold category of International Problems and Domestic Problems. Under the former general topic, Baird concisely summarizes the issues involved in Indo-China, Formosa, Western Europe and Control of Atoms and Disarmament. In the area of Domestic Problems he discusses Communism and Censure of Senator McCarthy, Political Campaign, Foreign Trade, Education and Religion. This well-written nine page Introduction gives the discerning reader adequate information that effectively facilitates the placement of particular speeches against the background of specific issues.

In agreement with Professor Baird, it must be emphasized that this volume is a reference source and can be genuinely helpful for subject information, speeches and speakers that are to be studied as types. The editor is again of much help to the reader with his masterful, brief introduction to each address. Having noted the apt reference to speaker, occasion and speech, an interested student will certainly

go further to examine individually the problems of textual authenticity, situation, content, organization, adaptation, immediate discoverable effects and the probable long range effectiveness of presentation. Also stimulating for the reader are the Appendix biographical notes which prove invaluable for that person who is concerned with a completely detailed understanding of the whole situation. The Table of Contents and the Cumulative Author Index are additional aids to a systematic review of many speakers and many issues since 1937.

The exact breakdown identified in the Table of Contents includes the areas of Foreign Relations, Economic Policies, Party Politics, Legislative Censure, Education and Religion. The most critical reader will probably feel that the inclusion of Eisenhower, Douglas, Nixon and Stevenson in the section on Party Politics gives a representative sampling. Particularly well chosen are the speeches concerning McCarthy—Stennis speaking for censure and John W. Bricker speaking against censure. In this election year, many may find the speeches by Dulles, Knowland, MacArthur, and Lodge on Foreign Policy interesting as comparative examples of what has been said earlier from the public platform.

This volume is a particularly good one; there should be no hesitation in urging comprehensive examination by that individual who seeks to understand the complex issues of today and to evaluate the effectiveness of communication concerning these issues.

This reviewer can enthusiastically express the wish that we may continue to benefit from Professor Baird's vast experience in the area of public address which provides judiciously selected representative American speeches.

A. L. THURMAN, JR.
Michigan State University

MRS. FISKE AND THE AMERICAN THEATRE. By Archie Binns, in collaboration with Olive Kooken. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1955; pp. x+436. $5.00.

Archie Binns' book on *Mrs. Fiske and the American Theatre* is enjoying a considerable vogue, and rightly so. It is a highly readable account of Minnie Maddern Fiske's career and of the theatre of her time. In an easy, informal style Mr. Binns records the progress of Minnie Maddern from her first stage appearance at the age of three singing a Scottish song and dancing a Highland Fling in a performance of the Maddern Family Concert Company to her years of greatness as Mrs. Fiske, America's leading exponent of the "modern" school of quiet, psychologically truthful acting. Mr. Binns' record also follows Mrs. Fiske through her later, less prosperous years to her final appearances in Chicago when she continued to act even though her friends and audiences realized that she was dying.

There is considerable excitement in the account of the planning and staging of each of Mrs. Fiske's productions and genuine pleasure in the record of her triumphs. One admires, too, her courageous fight against the Theatrical Trust, her campaign for kindness to animals, and her staunch adherence to an artistic code which was ahead of her time. One also enjoys the glimpses, which the book affords, of backstage life and of the great stage personalities of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

But along with these virtues, Mr. Binns' book has serious limitations. At no time does a clear and complete picture emerge of Mrs. Fiske as a woman or as an actress. The crises in her personal life are usually slipped over without explanation or comment. We are never sure, for example, why Mrs. Fiske and her distinguished husband maintained separate residences during most of their married life, or what led Mrs. Fiske to adopt a child in her later years, or what caused the estrangement between herself and her protégé cousin, Emily Stevens. Now and then we are afforded vivid glimpses of the Fiske personality and character but these are fragmentary and fail to add up to a complete portrait.

The same incomplete impression results from the glimpses of Mrs. Fiske as an actress. She had a distinctive style of acting and she practiced advanced aesthetic ideals which greatly influenced the theatre of her time, and yet, from Mr. Binns' accounts, it is impossible to visualize a performance by Mrs. Fiske or to grasp the essence of her individual style. There is much emphasis on the externals of each production and on their success or failure with the critics and the public. There is too little account of Mrs. Fiske's artistic methods and too little analysis of her actual manner of performance.

Mr. Binns' book is useful and absorbing as theatrical history and, as such, it is to be recommended; it is far less successful as biography or criticism.

GARFF B. WILSON,
University of California, Berkeley

THESE WERE ACTORS: A STORY OF THE CHAPMANS AND THE DRAKES. By George D. Ford. New York: Library Publishers, 1955; pp. xx+314. $5.00.

These Were Actors is the story of the Chapman and Drake families, active in English and American theatres during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. The author of the book is himself a descendant of the founders of both families; therefore he has a special interest in preserving family tales of such an illustrious theatrical heritage.

The narrative begins in John Rich's theatre in London; it ends in Ford's theatre in Washington. Of chief interest are the activities of: Uncle Billy Chapman, builder of what was probably the first showboat on western rivers; Samuel Drake, another ambitious theatrical pioneer on the frontier; and Caroline Chapman and Julia Dean, bright lights in American theatres.

Mr. Ford has written a readable book, and his publishers have made it an attractive one. Although he has taken some measures to authenticate his tales, he has obviously intended them for the casual reader rather than for the scholar. He has called freely upon his imagination to tie facts together with fiction. He has revealed a considerably sentimental attachment to his subject, for he has related romantic and melodramatic anecdotes with little restraint. His colorful story will prove of interest to the novice, but his inaccuracy in identifying "Charles D." Rice as the originator of the Jim Crow routine and his dependence upon recollections as "factual sources" will produce a feeling of insecurity in the student.

ELBERT R. BOWEN,
Central Michigan College

DRAMATIC THEORY: A BIBLIOGRAPHY. By Richard B. Vowles. New York: The New York Public Library, 1956; pp. 59. $.85.

Any addition to the shelf of bibliographies will be greeted by teacher and student with curiosity and joy: what has the compiler found that I have overlooked (and what have I found that the compiler has overlooked)? It is a roadmap for scholarly adventuring. When, as in the present instance, the compilation is the first in its subject, all potential users must immediately pronounce their gratitude. Partial bibliographies of dramatic theory have, of course, appeared earlier in Nicoll and in such books as Barrett Clark's *European Theories of the Drama*. But one of the first conclusions the reader of Vowles' list must reach is that Clark's basic anthology is no longer basic, is in fact sadly in need of complete revision. In the last quarter century the drama has inspired a full and lively literature, of a certain magnitude, involving a good deal of agon, anagnorisis and peripeteia.

Professor Vowles limits himself to what he calls the "essence of the play," and does not include items relating to the history or the production of drama, the nature of the stage, acting, design, directing. This decision, the sort of decision every compiler of a "tentative strategy" must make, might well be reconsidered in a future revision and expansion. The Preface notes that "Drama is a complex art": it would seem that one of the functions of a bibliography of dramatic theory might be to keep this complexity always before the eyes of the researcher. It is not necessary to repeat Baker's *Theatre and the Allied Arts*, but, for instance, any discussion of dramatic characterization which has not been illuminated by such works as Lewes' *Actors and the Art of Acting*, Sprague's *Shakespeare and the Actors*, or the anthology of Cole and Chinoy will soon find itself in Nephelococcygia.

Items are here entered under the headings of Theory in General, Aristotle's *Poetics*, Form, Content, Genre, Mode, Language and Poetry in the Theatre, Audience and Illusion, Drama Criticism. The main headings are in turn subdivided, e.g., under Genre—Comedy, The Comic, Commedia dell'Arte, Comedy of Humours, Comedy of Manners, Tragedy, Tragic Flaw, Modern Tragedy, Tragicomedy, Heroic Drama, Sentimental and Bourgeois Drama, Farce, Melodrama. Granted the intention of the compiler, the structure is impeccable. The majority of books and articles catalogued is, quite properly for a first publication, in English, though a number of items in the "major" European languages have been included. No distinction is made between popular and highly technical works, and Maurice Zolotow is completely at ease in the company of J. E. Spingarn. It is perhaps ironical that the bibliographer of dramatic criticism cannot permit himself the luxury of criticism, but students and teachers may use the work with confidence in its objectivity and completeness.

No bibliography is ever complete or final until the subject is long dead. Fortunately the drama, in spite of occasional intimations of mortality, continues to live and grow and change. Every user of this bibliography will therefore want to add items of his own discovering or addiction. Suzanne Langer's *Feeling*

and Form with its mystico-psychological academic chapters on the aesthetic of theatre might be included under Theory in General; John W. Draper's *The Humours and Shakespeare's Characters* is a possible entry under Hero and Heroine. Maud Bodkin's *Archetypal Patterns in Poetry* and Donald Stauffer's "The Modern Myth of the Modern Myth" (*English Institute Essays, 1947*), although not specifically directed at the elucidation of drama, are studies of basic importance. An article and a dissertation abstract are entered under J. V. Cunningham, but not his provocative book on the idea of tragedy, *Woe and Wonder*. Although history of the drama and stage are specifically excluded, many such works are at least as much critical and theoretical as historical. One thinks of Krutch's *American Drama since 1918*, Dane Smith's *Plays About the Theatre in England*, George Duckworth's *The Nature of Roman Comedy*, and Sir E. K. Chambers' *The Medieval Stage*. A strong reason for the addition of the last title is the inclusion under Religion and the Spiritual of Oscar Cargill's *Drama and Liturgy*, an attempt to destroy Chambers' thesis.

These marginalia are offered with the full understanding that the decision to omit is often as courageous as the attempt to be all-inclusive. But Professor Vowles must be assured that as in the once much-publicized case of Oliver Twist, it is not lack of respect but inner hunger that forces his grateful readers to say, not "Thank you," but "More. More."

ALAN S. DOWNER,
Princeton University

HANDBOOK OF SPEECH IMPROVEMENT. By Charles Kenneth Thomas. New York: The Ronald Press, 1956; pp. 135. $2.75.

Handbook of Speech Improvement, the most recent publication of C. K. Thomas, is specially designed to help people whose speech is inaccurate, indistinct, or suggests the patterns of another language. The author makes it clear in his Preface that his book does not concern itself with problems of voice, cleft palate, cerebral palsy, or stuttering. The purpose of the book may best be described by quotation of Professor Thomas' observation that

> Language consists of a system of vocal signals. For the system to operate, the signals must be kept distinct. On the theoretical level, this requirement leads to the phonemic principle. On the practical level, in this book, it means that a large number of the exercises provide opportunities for contrasting one sound with others. These contrasts should be well under control before the student practices other exercises for uniformity of sound. The book, however, is not prescriptive in setting up one standard of American pronunciation (p. iii).

Sounds are identified in the book by the symbols of the International Phonetic Association, "in the form most commonly used in the United States." For a more complete discussion of the sounds the student or teacher may refer to Professor Thomas' earlier *Introduction to the Phonetics of American English*.

In Part One, the Introduction, the author describes in a simple but scholarly way the linguistic-phonetic approach to regional standard American English speech sounds. The phonemes and allophones are then discussed in a general way in order to give the student a compact insight into phonetic theory; and some explication of non-English phonemic systems is provided for comparative purposes and to help the foreign student in his comprehension of the text.

Historical changes in English over the centuries have made English a difficult language for the foreigner to learn. Even within a single language at a given time phonemic patterns may be somewhat different. In large communities most people speak similarly enough for the differences to be overlooked. "To the visiting Philadelphian, however, the Portlanders will sound different, but understandable. The same situation holds true, in reverse, if the Portlander visits Philadelphia." A similar situation exists for the person from Savannah, Tulsa, Houston, or Seattle, and "it is with this large area of common speech that this book is largely concerned." To improve speech, however, one needs to know what speech is, and know it in detail. One also needs to know about the ways in which sounds are formed and their relationships to one another. A spelling system to represent the letter *a* in *at, ate, arm, army, all* and *about* is hardly adequate. Hence this book uses the I.P.A. symbols for the sounds and italicized symbols for the spelling, a system which this reviewer thinks might well be adopted by our dictionaries to help both the foreigner and the native speaker who have difficulty in reading and speaking English.

Part Two of the book, concerned with Consonants, shows in simple, diagrammatic, cross-sectional drawings the way each of the consonants of American English is formed. Con-

cise, uncomplicated instructions for the formation of each of the consonant sounds is given before the exercises for each set. The voicing or non-voicing, the pressure areas in the vocal tract, the nasality or non-nasality, the lip rounding or lack of lip rounding, and the organs that produce the preceding factors are clearly described and/or shown in the aforementioned diagrams. Word lists are given showing all possible contrasts of any reasonable length for pairs or sets of sounds. Sentences containing these contrasts complete the exercises in each instance. Short suggestions are interspersed in order to aid the regional speaker introduced to sounds that he may not be accustomed to using in some groups of words, and similar but different instructions are given to the foreigner to aid him in adapting to the English phonemic system. The consonants themselves are divided and grouped into the following categories: Lip consonants, Lip-Teeth consonants, Lip-Back consonants, Tongue-Teeth consonants, Gum Ridge consonants, the [r] consonant, Hard Palate consonants, Soft Palate consonants, and the [h] consonant. In the descriptive data under each category and each sound the terminology familiar to most phoneticians is noted.

Part Three, dealing with Vowels and Diphthongs, follows the same procedure as outlined in this review for the consonants. The vowels are divided and grouped into the following categories: Front Vowels, Back Vowels, Central Vowels with [r], and Diphthongs.

People concerned with improving speech—professors, teachers, native speakers of American English, Americans with a foreign accent, foreigners learning English as a second, third, or fourth language—will find *Handbook of Speech Improvement* a most valuable assistance to their study. Acousticians and psycho-acousticians who have been laboring with phonemes for an entirely different purpose will commend its format and simplicity. This reviewer will find it most helpful and only wishes it had been published earlier when she was teaching foreign students in large numbers from all over the world.

VIRGINIA R. MILLER,
Wellesley College

A HANDBOOK FOR SPEECH IMPROVEMENT: KINDERGARTEN—GRADES ONE TO SIX. By the New England Speech Association, Committee on Speech in the Elementary Schools. New England Speech Association, 1956; pp. 67. $1.50.

Prepared by the five-member Committee on Speech Education in the Elemenatry Schools of the active New England Speech Association, this volume will be welcomed by many as a brief, simple and valuable aid for the classroom teacher. *A Handbook for Speech Improvement* is designed to serve one purpose: to help the many teachers who ". . . feel the need for specific suggestions and teaching materials, especially for the speech skills involved in voice, articulation, enunciation and pronunciation."

As a handbook, it is largely a collection of materials and suggested activities for speech improvement. Some instructional materials for the teacher are provided, however, in the early pages under the headings "Using this Manual," "The Speaking Voice," "Check List of Voice Difficulties," "The Speech Sounds," "Check List of Common Errors on Consonant Sounds," "Suggested Activities for Speaking," and "Suggested Activities for Listening." Considering the fact that this little volume was written for the classroom teacher whose knowledge and training in the field of speech are extremely limited, at best, the writers have done a good piece of work in presenting this material. The trained clinician may be unhappy at first with its brevity, but if the classroom teacher will read this carefully and learn how to use the information, our elementary school pupils *and* the clinicians will benefit.

The specific materials and activities are presented according to grade levels. Each of these units (they would be "chapters" in most books) is divided into sections. "Basic Aims" and "Techniques" are common to all. Interestingly enough, the "Techniques" are identical for all six grades and the Kindergarten. They are: 1. Introduce all selections through group participation. 2. Encourage children to use the kind of voice suggested by the mood of the poems or rhymes. 3. Encourage children to use many descriptive actions and gestures. Other sections include: Relaxation, Posture, Being Heard, Auditory Discrimination (called "Sound Discrimination" in the Kindergarten section), Articulation (appearing at the Fourth Grade level), and various sections dealing with "Poetry and Literature." There is a bit of unevenness in the handbook in that the activities for Grade Four include sections on Oral Reading, Talks and Social Amenities as well as a separate section suggesting dramatizations, whereas these do not appear in earlier or later grades.

The one omission which seems significant is the lack of a Table of Contents. There is sufficient "white space" on page 2 to accommo-

date a simple one, and this would make the *Handbook* much easier to use.

A word should be said concerning the rhymes and exercises which have been included. The choices seem to be excellent. Teachers and pupils should enjoy them. The Association and, more particularly, the Committee are to be commended for this contribution to the cause of general speech training in the elementary school.

JOHN J. PRUIS,
Western Michigan College

TRIPPINGLY ON THE TONGUE. By Harry J. Heltman. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson and Company, 1955; pp. 122. $1.60.

Professor Heltman founded the Syracuse University Speech Clinic and directed its activities for many years. From the author's wealth of experience in the field of Speech he has prepared this handbook for the classroom teacher, the Speech therapist, or the Speech teacher.

The purpose of the text is directed toward reaching the optimum of distinctness in the pupil's everyday conversational speech. The classroom teacher is often confronted with the problem of "what to say" to the pupil who obviously needs motivation in meeting his speech problems. A suggested introductory dialogue between teacher and pupil may help the teacher who has a limited background in clinical practice. The author emphasizes the value of establishing a solid sociological background for the pupil's learning experiences, a development, if necessary, of the pupil's own responsibility for interest in his needs. This pupil-attitude is developed in part by having the pupil hear his speech deficiencies contrasted with a corrected pattern of speech.

The chapter on voice and its relation to speaking distinctly, emphasizes the psychological causes of inadequate volume in classroom situations; other factors include the distinction between voiced and voiceless sounds which often need to be taught through the teaching of hearing both types of sounds. The phonetic approach to the teaching of word structures which present mechanical hazards (found in such sequences as *lunched* and *wrenched*, a four-consonant blend), offers the teacher a step-by-step method of therapy with significant word and phrase drills.

Attention is given to the bilingual who needs help in saying his name with less of his native language dialect so that the English speaking listener may more quickly catch the unfamiliar consonant blends because of their distinctness, timing, and often changed emphasis. Approximately three-fourths of the text includes word, phase, and consonant practice material. The appendix, "that portion which ought to be read, too," suggests teaching methods for skills which might otherwise seem dull and uninteresting routine. The source material and a bibliography specifically directed toward the problem of distinctness make the text a most useful handbook for the speech teacher.

LOUISE KINGMAN,
Boston University

SPECIAL EDUCATION FOR THE EXCEPTIONAL. Edited by Merle E. Frampton and Elena D. Gall. Three volumes. Boston: Porter Sargent, 1955.

These three volumes represent by far the most extensive published work that has been done to date in the field of Special Education. There are a total of 1829 crowded pages of material. By rough estimate this totals somewhat over one million words. But it is not in wordage alone that these volumes make an extensive contribution to this field. Subject matter covered, the wide variety of aspects considered, the great amount of supplementary material, and other items make this a most comprehensive and imposing publication.

The organization of this work is interesting and sometimes puzzling. Volume I, under the title "Introduction and Problems," includes chapters on Historical Background, What is Special Education, Classification and Census, Public Education, Co-ordination of the Services of Official and Voluntary Agencies, Special Education and International Cooperation, Some Problems Common to All Areas of Special Education, Medical Services, Mental Health and Guidance, Educational and Administrative Problems, Teacher Training, Parent Education, The Prevention of Handicaps, Vocational Rehabilitation, Economic Security, Bibliographies for General Use in Special Education, Directories, Manuals and Lists of Agencies for General Reference, General Reading Bibliography, Useful References in the Field of Rehabilitation for Special Education, List of Magazines and Periodicals Serving the Field of Special Education, Official and Voluntary Agencies, U. S. Colleges and Universities Offering Courses in Special Education, Physical Therapy and Occupational Therapy, and Glossary.

Volume II includes chapters on: The Partially Sighted, The Blind, The Deaf, The Hard of Hearing, The Speech Defective, The Orthopedically Handicapped, The Cardiopathic—Rheumatic Fever, Special Health Problems, The Multiple Handicapped, Hanson's Disease, Mus-

cular Dystrophy, Tuberculosis, the Home Bound and Hospitalized.

Volume III is still more varied with chapters on: The Intellectually Gifted, The Brain Injured Child, The Cerebral Palsied, The Hemiplegic, The Epileptic, The Emotionally Disturbed, Juvenile Delinquency, The Mentally Handicapped, and Special Education Services in Related Areas, covering The Aged, The Narcotic and Alcoholism.

The authors have made generous use of authorities and existing materials in all of the fields they deal with, having reproduced many articles, verbatim statements, and descriptions of existing programs already prevalent in literature, or apparently written especially for these volumes. In fact, most of the three volumes are devoted to a reproduction of material already in existence, although the authors have done considerable explaining and describing on their own. The result of this kind of presentation is sometimes confusing and often repetitions. In certain aspects being discussed, two or three different writers present articles on the same topic. Most of these contain the usual introductory and historical background that is much the same, regardless of who presents it. This adds up to a great deal of what seems to be needless repetition. In spite of this drawback, the same kind of presentation assures a wide variety of ideas, opinions, methods, and programs which may benefit the careful reader. For this reviewer, the volumes appear to be especially useful because of the large amount of supplementary material that has been presented, such as the source material, the listing of agencies, of colleges and universities offering training, of very extensive bibliographies, the glossary and a usable subject index. In addition to this, footnotes have been well used to supply an additional source of information in some vital areas.

Of special interest to this reviewer in Volume I are an excellent definition of the rehabilitation team, some very usable tips on public education, publicity and public relations in Special Education, and a very useful chapter on mental health. In Volume II the discussion of "The Deaf" by Myklebust is excellent, as are the presentations of standards of audiology centers and information on resources for the deaf.

The discussion of speech defects leaves something to be desired, as is often the case in a comprehensive treatment of this nature, but there are some worthwhile aspects in this section. Cleft palate diagnosis and therapy have been well handled, as has therapy for aphasics. On page 536 of Volume II there is an excellent chart dealing with multiple handicaps. This will be found useful by anyone working in this field. The most valuable aspects this reader found in Volume III were some very practical details of speech for the cerebral palsied, and an excellent bibliography on cere bral palsy.

One disadvantage may be that the very extensive nature of these volumes would prevent widespread use for courses in Special Education or by individual workers in the field. The volumes would, however, make excellent reference material for anyone working with exceptional children. Reading is difficult because of the fine print. Different kinds and arrangements of material make for some confusion and interfere with good reading rate. Some of the materials, such as lists of institutions, agencies, and colleges, are somewhat out of date in a few cases. It may also be that the authors have tried to cover too much and that discussion of such areas as The Aged, The Narcotic, and Alcoholism, might have been eliminated. In all, however, this can be considered a notable contribution to the field of Special Education, and would make a very worthwhile addition to the library of anyone who is working in this field.

HEROLD LILLYWHITE,
University of Oregon Medical School

LANGUAGE: A MODERN SYNTHESIS. By Joshua Whatmough. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1956; pp. ix+270. $4.75.

Joshua Whatmough is Professor of Comparative Philology and Chairman of the Department of Linguistics at Harvard University and was Collitz professor at the Linguistic Institute in 1949 and president of the Linguistic Society of America in 1951. So much for the general signs of special competence. The more specific signs are misleading. After his university days at Manchester and Cambridge, Professor Whatmough taught classics in Wales and Egypt, then came to America to teach comparative philology at Harvard, where he has carried on for thirty years. The prevailing inclination of scholars with such a background is to keep away from and frequently to oppose developments outside the established philological line, as many teachers of Speech well know. But in his recent papers and his participation in discussion at meetings and in this book, Professor Whatmough has shown the greatest interest in and sympathetic understanding of the radical developments of linguistic science

of the last few decades: structural linguistics, acoustic analysis based on binary oppositions, the mathematical theory of communication.

The only claim to originality that can be, and is by the author, made for the present work is in the theory of selective variation. That theory is rather alluded to by name in connection with the discussion of this and that, where the referents of the terms are obvious in the context, than set forth explicitly with systematic exposition and exemplification; there is no chapter so titled. The scope of the work is wide and the interweaving elaborate. The specialized fields get related one to another, even if the treatment of each particular field may fall short of satisfying the experts, as the preface admits it may, or of adequately clarifying for the interested neophyte.

The chapters that one would not expect to find included in an over-all treatment of language are those on The Neural Basis of Language; Language: Society, Individual, and Symbol; Mathematics, Statistics, and Linguistics: The Mechanics of Language. As part of the appendices there is folded in a full-sized reproduction of a spectrogram which looks like the things one gets out of a spectrograph in routine operation, not too good to be true. The glossary is selective and a bit individualistic; the entry *formant* is glossed as "a bound form," a use which I cannot find elsewhere and not to be expected in a book with a spectrogram; it is explicitly noted that the adjective is *phonematic*, i.e., not *phonemic*. It's a book by an individual with temperament as well as learning.

LEE S. HULTZÉN,
University of Illinois

STUDIES IN COMMUNICATION. By A. J. Ayer and others: London, 1955, and published in the U. S. A. by Essential Books, Inc., Fairlawn, New Jersey; pp. viii+184. $3.40.

The Introduction of this book traces interest in problems of language at University College, London, back to such remote historical circumstances as the role of Jeremy Bentham in its nineteenth-century founding and Alexander Graham Bell's undergraduate interest there in the mechanics of speech before "proceeding to America and inventing the telephone." Nevertheless, it is with the unmistakable manner of one announcing fresh ventures into uncharted waters that Provost B. Ifor Evans, in the same Introduction, reports the founding of his faculty's Communication Research Centre (*sic*) following the decision of a number of "Professors and others" in 1953 "to discuss the need for more systematic studies on the problem of human communication"; and it is as "a first fruit" of this Centre's activities that the book itself is advertised on its jacket. One senses in the otherwise balanced, indeed circumspect, scholarly wording of the announcement, therefore, certain overtones suggesting the spirit of a headline—

FLASH: BRITISH SCHOLARS FIND NEED TO STUDY PROBLEMS OF COMMUNICATION! FORM RESEARCH CENTER! PUBLISH FIRST VOLUME OF STUDIES!

On this side of the Atlantic, of course, such ventures have lost the first blush of novelty. During the past twenty years an increasing number of articles in learned publications, including our own *QJS* and *Speech Monographs*, have been Communications-centered or Communications-slanted; and at least a dozen specialized university committees or institutes of one kind or another have been set up in the area, not to mention The National Society for the Study of Communication, founded in 1949, with its own official *Journal of Communication* now its sixth year of publication. Of all that the founders of the new London Centre appear to have been quite unaware.

But discounting our review volume for its quaint presumptions of innovation in the Introduction, we turn to its other contents. . . .

In a chapter on "Colloquial English and Communication" Randolph Quirk aptly observes that the grammatical and syntactical gap between conversational speech and written prose is much greater than is commonly realized. His suggestion that the redundancies of the former make for better retention of what is said, and that its "recurrent modifier's" are really "intimacy signals" facilitating the rhetorical ends of discourse, is greatly weakened, however, by poorly chosen transcripts of actual conversation. The examples strike this reader as tending to incoherence rather than intimacy, to the extent of downright inarticulateness. Surely, acceptance of the main thesis does not require us to find merits in the confused meanderings of sloppy thinkers and poor conversationalists!

Discussing "The Experimental Study of Speech," D. B. Fry gives an excellent brief review of recent experimental studies of articulation and the physical bases of speech audibility by means of such mechanical devices as the sound spectrograph and Haskins synthesizer. This chapter, however, is the reprint of

an article previously published separately in the magazine *Nature*.

Under the heading of "Communication of Thought in Ancient Greece," Professor of Greek T.B.L. Webster traces the evolution of typical grammatical forms which implemented the transition of Greek thought from what he calls the "primitive animism" of the Homeric period to the "modern civilized" views of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. He appears to do this, however, with incomplete awareness that, in tracing the parallel development of the Greek word *psyche* from an original meaning of "breath of life" in Homer to a later meaning of "rational soul" in the classic period, he is greatly complicating the professional life of his semanticist colleagues.

In still other chapters, R. Wittower discusses "The Interpretation of Visible Symbols in the Arts," J. Z. Yong takes up "The Influence of Language on Medicine," Sir Geoffrey Vickers analyzes "Communication in Economic Systems," Cohn Cherry explains "Communication Theory" as the mathematics of "information capacity" in a "communication channel," and J.B.S. Haldane gives a lively account of "Communication in Biology" with acknowledgement, nevertheless, that "this Chapter has been extremely superficial and often dogmatic."

J. B. Ayer, finally, discusses the question: "What is Communication?" Borrowing a familiar phrase from Wittgenstein, he finds that the term is used to label a number of different kinds of transactions having only a "family resemblance" to each other. The most interesting outcome of this chapter, however, is not the family portrait which follows. Neither is it the provocative statement, "we can learn what certan expressions mean, but not . . . what meaning is." Rather it is the afterthought—sobering indeed for an outstanding leader of the semantic and "analytic" movements in philosophy:

> . . . There is a great deal to be achieved by the study of semantics; but the successes which it has recently obtained must not deceive us into thinking that all our troubles would be over if only we could become clearer about the use of words, perhaps even that all we need is to find suitable definitions. For instance . . . a definition of a fair wage will not solve labour disputes. Or rather, getting people to admit that a wage is fair is not just a matter of getting them to agree about the use of a word: it is a matter of inducing them to be satisfied with the amount of goods that a certain sum of money will buy, and with its relation to what others are earning. It sometimes happens that what appear to be practical disputes are really verbal; but very often it is the other way about. (p. 28).

Viewed as a whole, therefore, this volume of *Studies* tends to give somewhat less attention to certain aspects of communication, like the process and controls of mass media channels, than a corresponding American work such as *Communications in Modern Society* (University of Illinois Press, Urbana, 1948). Nevertheless, as a collection of general essays (some of them reprints) written by a variety of specialists primarily engaged in other professional pursuits, the diversity of different approaches in this work illustrates once again the findings of our American experience: (1) that the subject is one of extreme complexity, and (2) that there is a real question whether there can be such a subject in the usual sense at all. If this book were to be submitted as the prospectus of a curriculum, we might ask, would University College London be likely to institute a Chair of Communication? Or is it possible that the most likely future of Communication in this and other institutions of learning is that of a common theme for collaboration among previously existing departmental groups?

In view of a number of similar questions to which this book gives rise, concerning parallel British and American experience with Communication, perhaps its greatest value may be due to the very insularity of its conception noted above. A common complaint of research in all the social disciplines is that it is almost impossible, in studying human transactions, to find an experimental object comparable to the physicist's body in a laboratory vacuum or the biologist's uncontaminated laboratory culture. Hence the deep interest of anthropologists, sociologists, psychologists, linguists, and their academic kin, in the folkways of any isolated tribe, be it ever so primitive. But here, by happy coincidence, is an example on a much higher cultural level of academic development self-contained in the vacuum of (self-imposed) scholarly isolation and therefore uncontaminated by cross-Atlantic currents of influence. Let us make the most of our opportunity to study this book carefully. It may provide something of the insight into Communication theory and practice that discovery of the Australian kangaroo and her island kin gave to Zoology.

WILLIAM R. GONDIN,
The City College of New York

CYBERNETICS: CIRCULAR, CAUSAL AND FEEDBACK MECHANISMS IN BIOLOGICAL AND SOCIAL SYSTEMS. Edited by Heinz von Foerster. New York: Josiah Macy, Jr. Foundation Publications, 1955; pp. 100. $2.75.

There have been ten conferences on Cybernetics sponsored by the Macy Foundation. To me, this is the most disappointing of the three printed Transactions I have read of the five published. At each session a group of experts from a wide variety of fields—psychology, psychiatry, biology, philosophy, mathematics, biophysics, anthropology, sociology, neurology, and others—pooled data, hunches, theories, and hypotheses. Only a few papers were read, the major part of the time being devoted to informal discussion. The verbatim reports of the eighth and ninth meetings made exciting reading. An idea would be presented, and it would be tossed around, rejected, elaborated upon, confirmed. For a person who does not pretend to be an expert in any of the aforementioned areas, this spontaneous interchange of thoughts proved most enlightening.

Unfortunately, this tenth and last conference was not reported verbatim, as were the others. The book consists of three papers presented without comment and a brief summary of points of agreement reached in the previous nine conferences. The reason for terminating the conferences was not explicitly stated, but I have a feeling they agreed to quit because, for the time being, they have had enough of broad generalizations and speculations and now need time for quantification and verification. Certainly the three papers presented at this conference had very little that was new.

The first "Studies on Activity of the Brain," by W. Grey-Walter, is more or less a summary of some of the ideas presented in his book, *The Living Brain*. The second, by Yehoshua Bar-Hillel, is titled, "Semantic Information and its Measures." It deals with the concept of semantic information as conveyed by a statement and various measures for this concept. As far as my understanding of his paper goes, I believe he commits the basic fallacy of splitting semantic content and its meaning from the evaluations of the reader. That is, he appears to assume that the meaning is to be found in the statement itself and is not conditioned by the speaker or listener. At the conclusion of his paper, he writes, "I find it utterly unacceptable that the concept of physical entropy, hence an empirical concept, should be identified with the concept of amount of semantic information, which is a logical concept, and this in spite of the recent attacks by excellent logicians on the logical-empirical dichotomy. . . . This is, of course, not the first time that physical functions have been described as being dependent on the state of the observer, including his state of knowledge. . . . It may be of some didactical importance to present certain arguments in terms of the observer, but one can do without."

The third paper by Yuen Ren Chao, "Meaning in Language and How It Is Acquired," consists largely of generalizations with examples from Piaget, Jesperson, Bateson, and Mead. He proposes six categories of elements that make up context varying from non-linguistic to linguistic factors: form and meaning, form and behavior, style, non-verbalized meaning of the form, and core meaning of the form.

The summary of the previous nine conferences by Warren McCulloch is the best part of the book, but I do not recommend it or the book for the novice in Cybernetics. For those more experienced in this field, there is little that is new.

HARRY L. WEINBERG,
Temple University

OPINIONS AND PERSONALITY. By M. Brewster Smith, Jerome S. Bruner, and Robert W. White. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1956; vii+294. $6.00.

This book reports results of an attempt to explore the interrelation of personality characteristics and opinions, particularly those opinions concerning a current controversial issue of importance. Extensive testing and repeated interviewing were used to collect information from a panel of ten male adults, all "normal." The method of the study is found in a sentence on page 70:

> In presenting our cases we are merely setting forth some individual examples of the functions of opinions in personality.

Of great interest are the discoveries of means by which opinions help the individual to adjust to the circumstances in which he lives, and the impact of attempts at adjustment upon his opinions.

Attitudes toward Russia were the basis of assessment of opinions, and how each subject felt about the USSR, its policies and people, was studied in relation to abundant information about his past and present personality. That the investigation was intensive is indicated by the fact that 28 separate procedures were completed for each interviewee, requiring fifteen two-hour sessions. The panel of ten subjects supplied a wide range of vocational

interest and achievement, different patterns of social relationships and varied opinions. All, however, were above average intelligence.

The student of opinion measurement will weigh "pro-con" counting procedures against the shadings of difference in attitudes indicated by these comments:

> P. 244: It was soon apparent to us that we could not begin describing an attitude until the qualitative pattern of its object had been set forth.
>
> P. 245: What of the over-all value set on Russia? It is difficult to describe with any precision save to say that the picture each had of Russia as a totality grew out of those few dominant features that stood at the top of his hierarchy of attention. It was as if, in each case, certain features were the principal determinants of the image as a whole. Abridgment of freedom, persecution of religion, threat to peace—from these the larger view grew. Some of our men could tolerate aspects of Russia that were discordant with their over-all view: others could see nothing discrepant.
>
> P. 247: It is when one observes the compression of rich individual opinions into the "yeas" and "nays" of policy stand that one senses the relatively narrow range of alternatives by which individual opinion can express itself on public matters. It is no surprise to find a plenitude of different motives bringing men together in a common stand on policy.

These statements suggest implications for opinion measurement, e.g., that most current scales fail to take into account the complexity of attitudes or the dynamics of their formation and change, hence are misleading.

The analyst of human motivation will gain insights into a further dimension of motive determination, opinion formation in the context of personality. Students of Speech may be assigned this reading as a convincing demonstration that human motive structures are complex, almost infinitely variable, and to a significant extent, self-contradictory.

Several methodological by-products of the investigation are as interesting as the conclusions concerning functions of opinion in personality. Some free response, "concealed" tests and the non-directive or permissive type interviews were found to be non-productive, or relatively so. Valuable information about opinions came from tests which contained "loaded" stimulus items and from interviews which directed responses strictly and placed stress, sometimes severe, on asserted attitudes. The authors believe that opposing and critically examining an opinion leads its owner to react as he might in real life, making possible an estimate of the intensity and importance of that opinion. The authors would not abandon the non-directive approach but would supplement it by "more dynamic methods that show how a person's opinions are deflected by situational pressure and become involved in his coping with new experience" (p. 285).

The book is well worth reading for its contribution to an improved understanding of ways in which a personality evolves the opinions it needs for self-preservation. Early chapters use pretentious language and are heavily academic in tone but once the case histories are under way, the going is easy. The ten men who provided the data for this study may find some satisfaction in the fact that they have made life more difficult than it would otherwise be for those of us involved in studies that purport to assess the opinions of other human beings.

WILLIAM S. HOWELL,
University of Minnesota

THE ART OF INTERPRETATIVE SPEECH: PRINCIPLES AND PRACTICES OF EFFECTIVE READING. By Charles H. Woolbert and Severina E. Nelson. (Fourth edition), New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1956; pp. ix+676. $4.50.

A textbook that has been used for almost thirty years and has undergone three revisions has probably established the validity of its subject matter and methodology. Nevertheless, the alterations in the fourth edition of *The Art of Interpretative Speech* significantly improve its style, coherence, and typography, modernize its literary repertory, and motivate student interest.

The fourth edition duplicates the third in general organization: I. Fundamental Principles of Interpretation; II, The Technique of Impression; III. The Technique of Expression. However, these sections vary greatly in amount of revision, Part III being essentially unaltered in content, Part I being rearranged, with the addition of the chapter 'On Technique" formerly in Part II, and Part II being extensively enlarged and reorganized. The revision of the earlier chapter on "logical setting" under a new subheading, "developmental forms," is perhaps the greatest single improvement in the new edition. Part II now consists of two chapters, "The Author" and "The Author's Meaning," which together contain subject matter previously assigned to Part I plus critical notes

on ten poets, a "short review" of poetic forms, and new discussions of "tone color" and three figures of speech.

Other new features include a list of recordings, critically analyzed and suggested as listening assignments, which should encourage the use of recordings for auditory training as an integral part of classroom activity. Drill materials from the chapters on vocal quality, force, pitch, and choral interpretation have been expanded and relegated to an appendix. The chapter on radio now includes three pages on television.

The new edition presents extensive new reading matter for the student. Additional selections are prefaced by intriguing comments and helpful suggestions. The student's interest in literary criticism is stimulated through selected quotations. Moreover, the interpretative repertory reflects the modern literary scene. Arnold, Burke, Keats, Lincoln, Webster, and Swinburne, for example, have been supplanted by Wilder, Eliot, Roosevelt, Maugham, E. B. White, and Thomas Wolfe. These changes are likely to receive general approval, except from the die-hard whose favorite selection has been eliminated. However, even if it has been retained, he may have difficulty in locating it, for selections have been regrouped and frequently retitled.

The fourth edition is quite likely to maintain the standing earned by its predecessors, reputed to rank consistently among the most widely used textbooks in the field of interpretation. A teacher seeking an introductory textbook will do well to examine this volume.

FRANCINE MERRITT,
Louisiana State University

HELPING THE BIBLE SPEAK. By Johnnye Akin, Seth Fessenden, P. Merville Larson, and Albert N. Williams. New York: Association Press, 1956; pp. 117. $2.50.

This slender volume by three Speech educators and a Bible specialist is in the best traditions of oral interpretation. Beginning with a well-substantiated claim that the Bible was not meant originally to be a book for silent and meditative reading but was written so that later generations could read it aloud, the authors explore the meaning of the Bible as the first step in oral interpretation. Appraising the Bible in its original setting, they suggest that the subject matter of the Bible can be conceived as a three-act drama depicting the emergence of God to mankind through the eyes of the children of Israel. The interpreter-to-be is next advised to bear in mind a several-step procedure for understanding any specific part of the Bible, with the admonition that a good Bible dictionary, an Atlas, and a Concordance are useful tools in "digging to the bottom of any problem of meaning as we prepare for the exciting adventure of reading aloud."

In terms suggesting an analogy of speech and music, the oral interpreter is urged to study the musical score, i.e., to determine the character and mood of the personality whose words the interpreter is to speak. He must clarify in his mind the original purpose the writer held for his listeners.

Subsequent chapters with such titles as "Pitch and Tone Quality in the Symphony of Voice," "Rate and Rhythm as the Symphony Plays," "Volume and Projection in the Symphony of Voice," "Imagery and Emotion—the Final Bridge to your Audience," present the student with a variety of techniques that are to provide animation and life as well as depth and understanding in the communication of Biblical excerpts.

Although helpful to the minister and layman who may be without the assistance of the teacher of oral interpretation, the volume will probably prove more useful as a supplementary text in classes in the undergraduate college, especially the church-related college. Teachers whose obligation it is to help the pre-theological student become a better oral vehicle for Biblical writings will welcome this short book as the teaching aid. In the theological seminary, to be sure, the teachers of Speech will give this book the heartiest welcome as the best single volume since S. S. Curry's *Vocal and Literary Interpretation of the Bible.*

HAROLD C. SVANOE,
Central College, Missouri

EFFECTIVE COMMUNICATION ON THE JOB. Edited by M. Joseph Dooher and Vivienne Marquis. New York: American Management Association, 1956; pp. 294. $4.50.

This book is a collection of writings designed to serve as a guide to better communication in business and industry. Many of the chapters have previously been published as articles in *Personnel;* others are training materials from company and AMA publications. It is strictly a "communications on the day-to-day job" guide, dealing almost exclusively with informal, face-to-face talking situations. Specifically the book deals with such things as the significance of day-to-day communications, problems of meaning, techniques of instructing, order-giving, reprimanding, talking safety, handling

rumors. In one of the best sections of the book the too much neglected area of "upward communication" is analyzed and unusually insightful suggestions given on how to improve it. Interviewing, including rating interviews, problem interviews, and employment interviews—with excellent treatment of non-directive techniques in all of these areas—comprises a substantial portion of the volume. The last two sections present material on conference leading and giving a talk. Within its selected scope it is the most complete presentation of communication techniques yet to appear.

This book is a valuable contribution to the literature on communication in human relations in general as well as in business and industry in particular. It deals with communication not just as a process of "selling" management ideas but as a process for achieving the kind of mutual understanding of thought and feeling that is rewarding both to management and employees, in terms of the material jobs to be done as well as the human lives to be lived. Although it is basically a "how to" book it presents its prescriptions in the context of a sound philosophy of human relations.

This book does not, however, provide an adequate discussion of the psychological basis for the techniques presented. Good communication, like good supervision, cannot be reduced to rules. While many useful principles can be stated, these principles cannot be effectively translated into behavior without an adequate appreciation of the human needs that underlie them. Admittedly, the rules can be reduced to the printed page while the appreciation cannot, but everything possible must be done to help the communicator achieve the necessary understanding of his own motivations and those of others. The reader cannot be relied upon to do this by himself. It is unfortunately true that the knowledge of psychology on the part of management personnel is often superficial even though they readily use the vocabulary of the human relations course.

This leads to another observation. It is undoubtedly true that the biggest obstacles to good communication on the job lie in the attitudes of the men in the management hierarchy. The member of management reading this book is made aware that the feelings, the needs, of employees greatly affect any communication with them; he is not made adequately aware of how much his own feelings, his own needs, affect such communication. When a person in authority communicates poorly with his subordinates, his own insecurity as a personality, his own emotional immaturity, is only too frequently a major factor. Where this is true, rule books do little more than provide a false sense of know-how.

A collection of writings by different authors on various aspects of a problem perhaps inevitably gives the feeling that the problem has been unduly fragmented. It would be helpful if the chapters in this book were tied together a little more closely. The chapters on conference leadership provide a case in point. The conference, after all, is part of the stream of thought and action in the organization and needs to be viewed as such, and not so much as a separate activity calling for a distinct set of techniques, although certainly it has techniques of its own. The already excellent suggestions on conference leading would be improved by being seen in better perspective. Perhaps the psychological background called for above could serve as the integrating factor.

Effective Communication on the Job, while it should be read by every member of management (and many employees as well), is probably not a book that will be read widely by first line supervisors. Although the material is basically simple, the word choice and format make it essentially a book for middle and upper management. This is unfortunate since the implication of the whole book is that the first line supervisor is a key figure in communication on the job.

This book should also be read by teachers of basic communication. Careful reading of it would help the teacher of speech better to understand the process of communication as it functions in situations where complex relationships and feelings impinge upon it, and keep him from viewing the process of informal speech too simply. In addition, it would provide helpful material for the teacher of speech who is called upon to assist business and industry with their communication problems.

THOMAS R. NILSEN,
University of Washington

THE FOCUSED INTERVIEW: A MANUAL OF PROBLEMS AND PROCEDURES. By Robert K. Merton, Marjorie Fiske and Patricia L. Kendall. Illinois: The Free Press, 1956; pp. xxii+185. $3.00.

In this revised third reprinting of a report from Columbia University's Bureau of Applied Social Research, the authors aim to make "clearer than before the uses, procedures and limitations" of a distinctive and somewhat specialized research method backed up by more

than a decade of clinical experience with individuals and groups. The full title is accurate: it is properly called a manual, thorough and detailed enough for specialists, with ample and well-chosen examples to show what goes right and wrong with focused interviewing. And a wealth of tried procedures have been integrated into the report so that even the novice could learn much, independently, by using this manual as one means of training himself.

The primary objective of the focused interview—"to elicit as complete a report as possible of what was involved in the experience of a particular situation"—suggests not only direct uses in descriptive research and clinical work in Speech but also adaptation and application in discussion, for example, and in conferences with students. At least certain techniques of "lessening . . . the gap between interviewees' *perceptions* of a situation and their *report* of what they have perceived" would come in handy many times when research is farthest from our thoughts. Thus the chapters devoted to specificity, retrospection, personal contexts, range, and depth are relevant reading and potentially rewarding to almost any Speech teacher. In another chapter, the teacher of discussion or similar courses will want to weigh the advantages and disadvantages of the group interview in settings where the size, composition and spatial arrangements differ. The section on procedures in this same chapter includes a three-page discussion of lead silence and pregnant silence that is alone worth the price of the book. This part is better written than pages here and there where the writers take it for granted that we know what they mean by "the objective facts" and "the subjective definitions of the situation." Generally speaking, the style gives us the conventional illusion of "scientific objectivity," but the authors have given us in their style—perhaps unwittingly—another document in support of those who have learned that complete objectivity in science may be an ideal of the sophisticate but a snare and delusion to all the rest. By making a place for the focused interview in social science, Merton, Fiske and Kendall are showing us by example how to face, control and utilize "subjective" methods in "objective" research.

ELTON S. CARTER,
Pennsylvania State University

THE TELEVISION-RADIO AUDIENCE AND RELIGION. By Everett C. Parker, David W. Barry and Dallas W. Smythe. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1955; pp. xxx+464. $6.00.

On January 2, 1921, two months after KDKA's first transmission, the Rev. Edwin J. Van Etten, Rector of Calvary Episcopal Church in Pittsburgh, braved a microphone to broadcast the first radio sermon. In commenting on this dramatic experience, he recalled: "It never occurred to me that the little black box was really going to carry the service to the outside world. . . . I thought there would be some fluke in the connection, and the whole thing would be a fizzle!" Actually this initial venture in religious broadcasting, if for no reason other than novelty, could scarcely have failed. Unhappily, Van Etten's successors in the field of religious broadcasting, as is made painfully clear in this excellent volume by Parker, Barry, and Smythe, also operate under false illusions, and have managed all too successfully to fulfill the pioneer's concluding pessimistic prediction.

The Television-Radio Audience and Religion, a meticulous, highly objective research study, uses New Haven, Connecticut, as a laboratory to determine what classes of people watch or hear which programs and with what effect. Employing a large staff under the supervision of Yale Divinity School, the authors used a five per cent audience sample, previously constructed and tested by Yale's Department of Sociology. By careful statistical analysis of the New Haven radio-television audience, and through a series of highly interesting interviews with "typical" listeners, the authors sought answers for questions vital to the religious broadcaster. What are the social, economic, educational, and religious backgrounds in the audience of Norman Vincent Peale, Fulton J. Sheen, Ralph W. Sockman, Charles E. Fuller, and Billy Graham? What impact do these and other religious broadcasts have on the listeners? Do they increase or decrease church attendance? Are the shut-ins served fully? Can the Christian message be faithfully interpreted through radio and television? What attitudes dominate the thinking of the New Haven ministry toward mass communication media? Perhaps the most startling disclosure revealed that the New Haven clergy, admittedly far above the national average in the skilful use of these new media, nevertheless lacked the minimum essentials of training and were distressingly naive in their approach to religious broadcasting.

The authors recognize the limitations of the study, and the impossibility of answering all of these questions conclusively. While the approach is Modernist-Protestant, the writers are eminently fair in their analyses of programs

and audiences from widely different religious groups. As a pilot study it lays the groundwork and sets a high standard for additional research in this area. Moreover, it holds much interest for students of rhetoric and public address. Speech criticism of the various radio personalities, principally Sheen, Sockman, Fuller, and Graham, occurs frequently throughout the book.

For teachers and students of radio and television, particularly those concerned with educational and religious broadcasting, this book should be required reading. The final chapter, dealing with strategy, opens new vistas for theological broadcasters. One result may be fewer ill-conceived, poorly directed, hastily produced programs which can only misfire.

PAUL H. BOASE,
Oberlin College

HOW TO DIRECT FOR TELEVISION. Edited by William L. Kaufman. New York: Hastings House, 1955; pp. 96. $2.50.

This book is a collection of nine articles written by directors of programs such as *Omnibus, Producer's Showcase, Lux Video Theatre,* and *Kraft Television Theatre.*

As one might expect, some articles are better than others. The more valuable treatments are by Garry Simpson, Sidney Lumet, Stanley J. Quinn, Clark Jones, and Delbert Mann. Simpson gives a complete, well-organized picture of the television director's work. Lumet shows how a director's point of view affects every phase of his work. Quinn gives good advice on how to work with television actors. Jones takes the reader to a rehearsal of *Your Hit Parade,* and includes some stimulating and refreshingly specific information on camera use for dance and musical numbers. Mann advises the prospective television director how to prepare for the first job.

Articles by Herbert Swope, Jr., William Corrigan, Donald Hillman, and Peter Birch are of less value. Swope makes the point that one should always be on the lookout for fresh talent, but seems overly anxious to impress the reader with the fact that he discovered Maggie McNamara and Biff Elliot. Corrigan overdoes his argument that the theatre is the best training ground for television directors. Hillman urges remote television experience as the best background for a director. Birch once did a successful job of staging the song "Prisoner of Love" for the *Jack Paar Saturday Night Series* and tells about it.

One of the most interesting questions raised by the authors is: Which comes first, the camera or the play? The consensus is that it is better to let the camera shots develop from the action of the play rather than let the camera determine action.

A theme running through the book is that lack of time prohibits perfection in television directing. Lack of sufficient space in this book also prohibits perfection—or anything near it. Many ideas have been stranded for want of development. Swope advises, for example. "Lighting, cameras, sets, audio and sound effects are all part of your responsibility. Be aware of them." Could any advice be less meaningful? Quinn wants television directors to "repeat acts in such a way as to concentrate on chief memory problems. . . . ," but does not explain what he means.

With all its faults, *How to Direct for Television* is worth reading. It would be valuable either as supplementary material for a beginning course in television directing, or for anyone interested in thumbnail sketches of current television directing practices.

WILLIAM J. LEWIS,
University of Vermont

BRIEFLY NOTED

PUBLIC SPEAKING FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS. By Lionel Crocker. (Third Edition). New York: American Book Company, 1956; pp. xv+511. $4.75.

Its essential soundness proved by fifteen years of acceptance as a standard college text, *Public Speaking for College Students* now appears in an attractive third edition which should prove even more useful than its predecessors.

The new edition retains the over-all organization of the first two, but has been significantly revised. In Part I, *The Speaker,* the chapter on "Maxims for Public Speakers" has been deleted in favor of a new one, "Techniques of Thinking and Speaking." (The maxims have been moved in outline form to the appendix). In Part II, *The Speech,* a new chapter, "Seven Techniques of Support," has replaced the previous one on "The Illustration." Part III, *The Audience,* retains the four familiar chapters, but Part IV, *The Occasion,* has been augmented by a new chapter on "Face-to-Face Speaking." These changes have in the main strengthened the book. Although the material on techniques of support falls short in the satisfying richness of detail we expect from Crocker, the rest of the additions are sound. The chapter on face-to-face speaking provides much practical advice, while the

one on techniques of thinking should be a stimulating guide to the students' processes of invention.

In addition to the new chapters, many of the old ones have been rewritten or altered. The first has been so changed that it is virtually impossible to find paragraphs carried over from the second edition. Other revisions consist generally of changes in illustrative material to keep the book fresh and within the student's background. Many of the chapters, however, have received new titles which tend to stress the *why* and *how* of speaking and should result in a stronger appeal to the student. New material likewise appears in the appendices.

Like previous editions, this is founded squarely on classical doctrine, possesses a happy wealth of lively illustrative material, and is framed in terms of the student reader. It shows, however, an increased awareness of and adaptation to the function of speech in American urban and industrial society. Withal, it should be a text highly appreciated by both student and teacher.

JAMES N. HOLM,
Kent State University

BASIC PUBLIC SPEAKING. By Paul Soper. (Second Edition). New York: Oxford University Press, 1956; pp. xx+374. $3.85.

In his Foreword, Professor Soper enumerates features he has retained from his first edition, 1949, and changes he has made.

His list of similarities—emphasis upon composition, fairly equal balance between treatments of informative and persuasive speaking, liberal use of examples, simplicity of style and approach, and explicitness of organization—accurately identifies some of the principal strengths of both editions. Some of the changes he enumerates represent not only marked improvements but genuine contributions, e.g., an increased emphasis upon communication and a more explicit relating of speech planning to audience motivation.

Other claims of revision are misleading. Although subsections on comparisons and contrasts and on visual aids become "new sections" in the new edition, the actual treatment of the former is revised only slightly, and the material of the latter is verbatim. "Many new illustrative examples have been added," but about 90% of the examples of the second edition appeared also in the first. "New suggested speech topics have been added," but these amount to less than 8% of those enumerated. Even more misleading is the following assertion: "Treatment of Microphone Speaking has been emended to cover television speaking." The emendations include inserting "television" into several titles and subtitles, substituting other terms for "radio" several times in the text, and adding five new sentences on bodily action for television speaking.

Real changes clearly seem less than claimed and less than might reasonably be expected. Unfortunately, comparisons of revisions of several other widely used public speaking textbooks reveal a similar practice and indicate that we very much need to define standards for textbook revision and apply them to current practice.

In spite of limited revision, the second edition of *Basic Public Speaking* merits consideration for college courses. Principles are well organized, generously exemplified, and consistently synthesized by an emphasis upon communication.

WAYNE E. BROCKRIEDE,
University of Illinois

HOW TO OVERCOME NERVOUS TENSION AND SPEAK WELL IN PUBLIC. By Alfred Tack. Minneapolis: T. S. Denison and Co., 1955; pp. 242. $3.00.

The publisher suggests that this reassuringly-titled volume "will be valuable as a text for high school and college students because it is so practical." My painful duty is to report at once that, contrary to the publisher's expectation, there is but little likelihood of use in such institutions.

The writing is frequently poor. There are strange expressions, such as ". . . possibly he will drink two or three glasses of water running" (p. 61) or, "It is pouring with rain, but the view is perfect" (p. 59), or "In days gone by explorers read papers on their return from the wilds, and read them before learned bodies" (p. 22).

The author is guilty of sweeping, glib generalizations, some of which surely seem open to definite question. Thus we are assured, "Once you know the fundamental techniques of speaking in public, you can never make a bad speech" (p. 11). Again, we read ". . . if you are enthusiastic, you won't find speaking in public hard to master" (p. 18).

Some of the counsel offered is of doubtful value, as in "If a speaker does not find gestures come naturally to him, then he must try to do something about it" (p. 46).

The author is, however, quite enthusiastic.

Too, he rightly spends much time in attempting to teach the correct way to overcome nervousness. There are some good points in his chapters on speech-building, human relations, and the duties of a chairman.

But the author endlessly talks with his brother (indeed, the book opens with "Don't worry about it," said my brother George. "You probably need a rest. Go away for a week.") There are frequent references to the author's "twenty years of lecturing and making speeches," "six lectures a day, thirty lectures a week, for fifty-two weeks in the year." Even if the jacket blurb had not stated the fact, the reader soon learns, by wearisome repetition, that the author is the director of a school of public speaking. No doubt this volume will be used there.

THEODORE G. EHRSAM,
New York University

MOTO-KINESTHETIC SPEECH TRAINING. By Edna Hill Young and Sara Stinchfield Hawk. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1955; pp. x+176. $5.00.

This revision of an earlier text, *Children with Delayed or Defective Speech*, will be of particular interest to those who have used the moto-kinesthetic method described in detail in the current volume by its originator, Mrs. Edna Hill Young. Her discussion of the background and the techniques of the moto-kinesthetic method as an approach to the correction of various types of defective speech makes up Part One of the volume. Dr. Sara Stinchfield Hawk's contribution is in Part Two, which presents a consideration of delayed speech development, of physical and mental examinations, of speech tests, and of the blind and the mentally deficient child.

In Part One, Mrs. Young presents first a discussion of the air current as the basis of speech. She then suggests that the visual, auditory, tactile, and kinesthetic senses be used in speech training, the visual concept, the sound, and the feelings of movement in sequence being combined in a "method of definite stimulation to the speech muscles" that is the "moto-kinesthetic method." Chapters Three, Four, and Five present the "standard stimulations" that are recommended for the voiceless consonants, the vowels, and the voiced consonants. In the remaining chapters in Part One, Mrs. Young applies the moto-kinesthetic method to such specific problems as sound substitution, cleft-palate speech, the speech of the deaf and hard-of-hearing, cerebral palsy, aphasia, and stuttering.

The many examples cited by Mrs. Young are interesting but often tend to break the continuity of her discussion and, in some instances, do not illustrate the specific point being presented. The pictures used in Part One would be more useful if they appeared closer to the "stimulations" they illustrate rather than being grouped in the center of the section.

In Part Two, Dr. Hawk reviews many studies that have dealt with evaluating mental ability, physical condition, and speech. This part of the book carries few references to the moto-kinesthetic method, although recommendation of the method appears in summaries at the ends of two of the chapters.

Although the two parts appear in a single volume, they seem unrelated and do not show careful correlation in planning and writing. The impression that Mrs. Young's presentation is based primarily on personal experience and Dr. Hawk's on research findings is confirmed by the difference in the number of footnotes in the two sections of the book. An intermingling of the two parts, with thorough organization and integration of the ideas, would have strengthened the presentation.

CHARLOTTE G. WELLS,
University of Missouri

SPEECH HANDICAPPED SCHOOL CHILDREN. By Wendell Johnson, Spencer F. Brown, James F. Curtis, Clarence W. Edney, and Jacqueline Keaster. (Revised edition). New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956; pp. 575. $4.50.

In 1948 these authors produced a unique and highly useful textbook on speech correction aimed at classroom teachers, parents, and others with no technical training in the subject matter. This revision is improved by eight years of study, research, and experience. It is changed in three major ways. Generally, the text is brought up-to-date on pertinent research and thought in speech pathology and therapy. Not only have new pertinent materials been inserted to amplify and enrich the discussion, but old references have been more thoroughly footnoted and expanded in many instances.

The problem of stuttering is presented in a new and more comprehensive manner. A discussion of definition is based on much recent research material. Extensive evidence is cited on the question of psychosis or psychoneurosis in stutterers. The therapy program is divided into speech correctionists' responsibilities and

those things which the classroom teacher can do, clarifying the somewhat confusing ten-point program previously suggested. There is a new outline of aspects of stuttering which can be changed or improved and a new discussion of parent counseling.

The public school speech correction program is evaluated from the popular "team approach," with extensive analysis of the responsibilities and relationships among the correctionist, classroom teacher, parents and the child himself. The public school program is presented in a much more practical manner than previously.

The changes in this edition should serve to maintain and strengthen the usefulness of the book as a current, practical text for introductory speech correction classes and survey courses.

WAYNE L. THURMAN,
Eastern Illinois State College

LINGUISTIC SCIENCE AND THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH. By Henry Lee Smith, Jr. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956; pp. 61. $1.50.

For the many teachers who, directed to articles dealing with modern linguistic structural studies, have been confused by new terminology and esoteric procedures, this little book is a welcome door-opener. It is by one of America's distinguished linguistic researchers, but one who differs from some of his colleagues in being able to write simply and cogently for the non-professional. Originally presented as one of the Inglis guest lectures in Harvard's Graduate School of Education, the book succinctly but with utmost clarity outlines the rationale of the structural approach to a description of the system of English speech. With special reference to his first audience of educators, the author has skilfully offered a plain factual analysis in such a way that its portentous and revolutionary implications for the teaching of English speech and writing become obvious. The relationship between language and writing, the breakdown of English into its basic segments or phonemes and then in to the long-unidentified but essential features of stress, pitch, and juncture—these Professor Smith successfully describes within the limits of a single lecture.

Perhaps this is not the book you need, but it may well be the one to be gently presented to associates who still enjoy their linguistic cultural lag.

HAROLD B. ALLEN,
University of Minnesota

A GUIDE TO CHAUCER'S PRONUNCIATION. By Helge Kökeritz. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, and New Haven, Conn.: Whitlock's, Inc., 1954; pp. 32.

This booklet forms an excellent supplement to the general remarks on Chaucer's pronunciation usually found in anthologies and editions of Chaucer's works. It "aims to provide teachers and students of Chaucer with a simple and dependable guide to his pronunciation without involving them in the intricacies of Middle English phonology." The dependability of the book is assured by the authority of Professor Kökeritz, whose extensive work in the field of English pronunciation has achieved well-deserved recognition. The *Guide* contains a "Key to Phonetic Symbols," a general introduction, some "General Rules of Pronunciation," and some selections printed in phonetic characters. The forms used are those of the API as they are employed in the standard works of Daniel Jones. It is obvious that the booklet will be especially useful in courses where students may be assumed to have some previous knowledge of phonetics.

Since, as Professor Kökeritz says (p. 9), "we shall never be able to find out exactly how Chaucer spoke," phonetic renditions of Chaucer's text, like those of any other text which may not be heard, are, linguistically speaking, imprudent. The present transcriptions make some allowance for this fact by inserting possible variants in footnotes. Whether transcriptions of Chaucer are exactly correct scientifically does not really matter, since it is extremely important for purposes of literary appreciation that students be encouraged to pronounce and to hear Chaucer's lines in a manner which makes them seem natural and expressive. The present booklet should be extremely useful for this purpose. One "rule," that final -e is always pronuounced "at the end of a line," although it has been supported by various scholars with strong arguments, sometimes leads to an artificial rendition inconsistent with the generally conversational tone of Chaucer's verse, especially when the next line after the final -e begins with an unstressed vowel.

A 10-in. long-playing record of some of the passages transcribed in the *Guide* as they are recited by Professor Kökeritz is available from Whitlock's. The rendition is clear and easy to follow, although the general effect is, perhaps as a consequence of a desire for clarity and accuracy, somewhat dry and academic, and the intonation, which for literary purposes is

more important than the precise pronunciation of individual words, is not always convincing.

D. W. ROBERTSON, JR.,
Princeton University

A HISTORY OF THE THEATRE. By George Freedley and John A. Reeves. (Revised Edition). New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1955; pp. xvi+784. $6.00.

We are indebted to the distinguished Curator of the Theatre Collection of the New York Public Library for the revision of this standard work in theatre history which adds some fourteen years to the recorded events of world theatre. The principal contribution of the new edition, of which Mr. Freedley is the author, is a supplementary section covering the years 1940-1954.

Revisions to the original section are mainly corrections of errors, additions of birth and death dates, and alterations of the text where death or more recent appraisement of people or plays mentioned requires it.

Mr. Freedley succeeds in his terse, repertorial style in covering in seventy odd pages just about all the principal geographical areas of theatre development. Some of the chapters, as for example Chapter II, *Belgium*, Chapter VIII, *Yugoslavia*, and Chapter XII, *Ireland*, are limited to a single paragraph. As a matter of fact many countries are given "mere mention" since I presume nothing important theatrically has happened within their borders to merit a detailed discussion. The author has most certainly adhered to the avowed purpose of the original edition to be simple and brief.

Chapter XI, *England*, is handled with authority and precision. It, together with Chapter XVI, *U.S.A.*, proved to be the most interesting and thoroughly readable of the sixteen "chapters" which constitute the supplement. The comments on the state of the postwar German theatre and the developments within the Soviet Union are quite informative although I suggest that the author would do well to leave political prognostication to commentators and avoid such statements as, "Perhaps with political reason for aligning the U.S.S.R. with its Asiatic section, there has been a display of dramatic interest in Chinese, Malayan and Hindu culture. This pursuit of Euro-Asiatic culture, if pressed too far, could mean the destruction of Western civilization as we know it."

The principal weakness of the new section is what for want of better terms I shall call "play listing" and "naming." Mr. Freedley feels that mere listing of play titles, without comment, as in Chapter XIII, *Greece*, is of value to theatre historians and scholars. With this I agree. But wouldn't this purpose be served just as well by listing them in a separate index or appendix? I felt the same way about Chapter IV, *Italy*, the section of Chapter V devoted to Austria, and to a certain extent Chapter VI, *Russia*. Long lists of producers, actors, and designers, with no accompanying indication of their specific contribution, tends to become monotonous for this reviewer.

Although *A History of the Theatre* is devoted to the "live theatre," I hope that a future edition will include a longer discussion of the movies and television than that given in the revised Epilogue. These media are theatre in every sense of the word and the influence which they have exerted and are exerting on the legitimate theatre is tremendous.

Within the limits which the authors set for themselves in 1941, however, Mr. Freedley, working alone, has been admirably successful in the augmented edition. I just happen to believe that it is part of the historian's job not only to record events but to indicate their significance, to point out new developments, past tendencies, major strengths and weaknesses—in simple terms to exercise critical judgment along with the job of objective reporting.

THOMAS D. PAWLEY,
Lincoln University, Missouri

SHOP TALK

LOREN REID, *Editor*

THE 1956 SPEECH-THEATRE CONFERENCE at Chicago will have so many new features that Shop Talk wants to spell them out for everybody.

FIRST AND FOREMOST is the fact that we now have four active convention days, not three. The Speech Association of America, the American Forensic Association, the Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials, and the National Society for the Study of Communication have scheduled their programs for December 27, 28, and 29. (They have certain pre-convention committee and council meetings on December 26.)

The American Educational Theatre Association has scheduled its program for December 28, 29, and 30. (It has certain pre-convention meetings on December 27.)

December 27 is relatively free for programs of the first-named groups; and December 30 is free for programs in drama and the theatre.

Convention-goers have often wanted to have opportunity to attend more meetings, with fewer conflicts in their specialized fields. This new plan of using staggered dates reduces the number of conflicts. The heads of all the Associations urge every one to plan to be in Chicago all four days—December 27 through 30, inclusive.

A SECOND NEW FEATURE is that the SAA programs are this year, for the first time, planned by the new Interest Groups.

How has this worked out? More people than ever before have been consulted in planning the section meetings. New ideas and new approaches have shown up on the program. As of September 1, the program was 95 per cent complete, indicating that the Interest Group vice-chairmen and program sponsors ploughed right into their new assignments.

Each Interest Group is conducting, besides its section meeting or meetings, two business meetings, for the purpose of perfecting its organization. Shop Talk predicts that the most rarefied and specialized shop talk going on during the whole convention will take place in these Interest Group sessions. If you are a high school teacher, for example, you may imagine being in a room full of other high school teachers. Or if your specialty is voice, phonetics, discussion, speech pathology, or what not (there are 18 Interest Groups in all) you will have an unparalleled opportunity to meet with others also claiming your specialty. Go to different Interest Groups if you wish—the groups meet at eight different hours.

A THIRD NEW FEATURE is the SAA Legislative Assembly. On another page of this *Journal* you will find the names of those who have been elected to this group; these folks will meet on December 26 for their first meeting. The Assembly will be responsible for formulating a good deal of Association policy, and its deliberations will be viewed with interest. With policy in the hands of a large group, instead of a relatively small council, the Association should be more responsive to whatever new ideas emerge.

BUT BACK TO THE PROGRAM itself. The Convention Breakfast, scheduled for 8:00 a.m. December 27, is enough of an innovation to tell you about.

Here is the way it will operate. Breakfast will be served buffet style in the Coffee House (one of the nice, large, dining rooms of the Conrad Hilton—capacity about 225) beginning at 8:00 a.m. Come in at any time between 8:00 and about 8:45, pick up your orange juice, scrambled eggs, bacon, sweet rolls, and coffee, and eat and visit with your friends. Promptly at 9:00 Lester Thonssen will unleash the following After-Breakfast Speakers: Bower Aly, Milton Dickens, T. Earle Johnson, Magdalene Kramer, Richard Murphy, Arthur Secord, and Andrew Weaver. They will have five minutes each to report on "What's New and What's Behind What's New."

You will notice that the speakers come from all sections of the country, and that they represent a variety of interests. Moreover, each one is reported to have a gift for pungent and colorful expression. This will be the first Convention Breakfast ever attempted. It may be the last! If you want to be sure to hear the program, send Executive Secretary Waldo Braden $1.75 for a ticket. The Coffee House may not hold quite every one who wants to attend.

THE CONVENTION LUNCHEON, scheduled for noon of December 28, is the one event at which all the associations come together. The main topic of discussion will be "How to Raise Teachers' Salaries." The speaker will be Professor W. Norwood Brigance, of Wabash College. Following him, a two-member panel will comment: Professor H. Clay Harshbarger, newly-appointed chairman of the Department of Speech at the State University of Iowa, and Mrs. Elsie Parnell, president of the Texas State Teachers Association.

This topic is critical and vital, else none is. It is full of awe and wonder. If we as a profession are to uphold the quality of our membership, we must look to the economic necessities of teachers. The comments expressed will be given wide, responsible publicity (if you have suggestions or statistics, forward them to the speakers).

TO REFRESH YOUR MEMORY, here are the eighteen Interest Groups:

Administrative Policies and Practices
American Forensic Association
Business and Professional Speaking
Discussion and Group Methods
General Semantics and Related Methodologies
High School Discussion and Debate
History of Speech Education
Interpretation
Parliamentary Procedure
Personal and Social Psychology of Speech
Radio, TV, and Cinema
Rhetoric and Public Address
Speech and Hearing Disorders
Speech for Religious Workers
Speech in the Elementary School
Speech in the Secondary School
Undergraduate Speech Instruction
Voice, Linguistics, and Phonetics

Each of these groups has a meeting on Thursday, December 26, the SAA pre-convention day; and Shop Talk advises those who want to get acquainted with other folks with the same specialty to show up on that date and make themselves known. The Interest Group meetings will be a little smaller that day than later. Each Interest Group has a second meeting, either December 27 or December 28, which gives an opportunity for further getting acquainted. As the meetings are staggered somewhat, you have a good chance of meeting with two or three different groups if you wish. When you receive your Convention Program, late in November, look over the schedule of Interest Group meetings. The program has been arranged so that there is surprisingly little conflict between them and the schedule of section meetings.

LOOKING OVER THE COPY for the section programs as it came in, your First Vice-President

was impressed by a number of matters—which cumulatively became striking. Such as:

The large number of demonstrations and "How to Do It" meetings;

The wide geographical and institutional representation of the speakers;

The sensible mixture of "names" and "comers";

The emergence of "new" specialties;

The appearance on programs of business and professional people (i.e., not teachers of speech);

The teas, coffees, breakfasts, open sessions, get-togethers;

Last minute ideas and developments (the 1956 campaign, color TV);

And many others: see your convention preview.

ALSO IMPRESSIVE is the array of section meetings organized by the American Educational Theatre Association. With more sections than ever before, this group is really covering that area: every imaginable aspect of writing, producing, directing, acting. We predict many SAA people will visit many of these sessions, and many will stay over for the December 30, all-AETA, program.

THOSE WHO HAVE NOT YET written a book may not have heard of the phrase "author's alterations." This is a special charge levied by publishers upon authors who alter their copy after the material is in type. Making changes at this late stage of the process is more expensive than getting the copy right in the first place, just as it is more expensive to tear out a partition and relocate it than it is to locate it in the right place first time up. So "author's alterations" is a touchy phrase among writers and publishers.

Sir Winston Churchill has come up with a new variant of this troubled theme. With his staff of writers and his six secretaries, he plans a work like *A History of the English-Speaking Peoples,* and hands out research topics like a professor assigning term reports. He takes their materials and studies them, dictating his revisions to a battery of stenographers. After their typescripts are sufficiently rewritten, he turns the latest revision over to a printer who puts the material into galleys of type. Then the process of revision really begins, galley after galley being revised and rewritten. Sir Winston's idea is, of course, that once he sees his stuff in type he knows whether he likes it or not. When the last galley is corrected, he supplies his publisher with a complete set of proofs.

"Everything I do is expensive," says Sir Winston light-heartedly, explaining these astonishing procedures.

THIS YEAR the Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials and Interstate Cooperation of the National University Extension Association plans to distribute an impressive quantity of free material on the national topic to high school discussers and debaters. About five thousand copies each of some twenty-six books and pamphlets—we make it a total of 130,000 pieces—will go out to students in 46 of the 48 states. Other thousands of debate items will be distributed at scandalously low prices—reaching a total circulation of well over 150,000.

The United States Senate became interested in the national topic. The issue of the *Congressional Record* for June 14 contains remarks by Senators Ellender of Louisiana, Johnson of Texas, and Aiken of Vermont. At one point in the discussion there was even a proposal to instruct the Legislative Reference Service and the staff of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry to prepare a Senate document on the national question, but differences of political opinion among the senators made it impossible to proceed with the plan in time for the debates this year.

THE OVERSEAS TROUPE of the University of Maryland completed a nineteen day tour of air force bases in the Azores, Iceland, and Bermuda. Under the direction of E. Thomas Starcher, 21 performances of *The Warrior's Husband,* plus variety acts, were presented. Twenty-five students participated in the tour.

THE SPEECH DEPARTMENT at The University of Texas inaugurated a program during the spring semester of this year whereby a series of professors in the field of speech visited the department for several days, each to give lectures and hold conferences for both staff and students. The guests were: Harlan H. Bloomer, University of Michigan; Raymond Carhart, Northwestern University; Orville A. Hitchcock, State University of Iowa; W. Norwood Brigance, Wabash College; and Magdalene Kramer, Teachers College, Columbia University.

TEACHERS OF PUBLIC SPEAKING will hear more and more about the Alexander Hamilton Commemorative Scholarships as the year pro-

gresses. Plans are still in the tentative stage, but in general one high school student (probably selected through a competitive arrangement) and one college student (probably selected through interviews) will be chosen from each of the several states and territories. The enterprise is a part of the nation-wide observance planned for the year 1957 under the auspices of a distinguished commission, of which the chairman is Karl E. Mundt, senator from South Dakota, and the vice-chairman is Frederick R. Coudert, Jr., representative in Congress from New York. Bower Aly of the University of Missouri is chairman of the Advisory Committee on Contests and Awards for the commission.

THE UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA announces an expansion of its program for the training of speech and hearing therapists. New courses in basic speech science and audiology will be taught by Martin C. Schulz, audiologist and co-director of the Speech and Hearing Center, University Hospital. Clinical practice in the hearing area will be conducted in the Center under the supervision of Dr. Schultz and Sylvia Semmler, speech therapist. Provision for clinical practice in cleft palate speech has been made in the Cleft Palate Clinic, Children's Hospital, under the supervision of Marilyn Bernhard, speech therapist; and a practicum for work with children with cerebral palsy will be conducted in the United Cerebral Palsy Chestnut Hill Center. The program is offered in the Department of Psychology, under the direction of Frank P. Bakes, associate professor and co-director of the Speech and Hearing Center.

THE QJS CONTINUES to attract attention abroad. Joyce L. Wilkins, editor of *Speech*, the journal of the College of Speech Therapists in England, wrote in March of this year requesting permission to reprint "Misarticulation and Discrimination of Speech Sounds" by Duane C. Spriestersbach and James F. Curtis. This article appeared in the *QJS* for December, 1951. On May 19, 1956, Harold J. Ripper, Editor of *Speech and Drama*, the journal of the Society of Teachers of Speech and Drama, also an English organization, requested permission to reprint in his issue for July of this year Wilma H. Grimes' article in the April *QJS* entitled "Choosing Literature for Oral Reading: A Psychological Basis." Both of these requests were granted.

W.S.H.

BEGINNING THIS YEAR there will be an official Oklahoma Senior College Forensic League including all eighteen four year colleges and universities in the State. Heretofore the only organization for four year colleges has been one limited to members of the Oklahoma Collegiate Conference. By action of the members at a business meeting in connection with the state tournament last March, the name has been changed to "Oklahoma Senior College Forensic League" and all colleges and universities have been admitted into membership. It will be something more than "just a tournament." The plans are to provide a year-round service comparable to that already provided for the Oklahoma High School Speech League and the Oklahoma Junior College Speech League. The service will include monthly newsletters, an *Official Handbook;* a clearing house for new ideas; and a state tournament.

WITH THE BEGINNING of the 1956-1957 academic year, the Speech Department of Fresno State College will be separated from the Division of Fine and Practical Arts and will be given independent divisional status. John W. Wright, the present department chairman, is to be head of the new division.

THE ILLINI FORENSIC Association of the University of Illinois has begun a weekly series of WILL-TV television programs entitled: Youth Faces the Issues. One week, a panel of four college students discusses the background of a question, analyzes the problems involved, and considers possible solutions. The second week, two of the panelists return to engage in cross-examination debate on a controversy which emerged the preceding week. The third week, a new panel and a new question are presented to the television audience. David B. Strother is moderator.

THE ANNUAL FINANCIAL REPORT just received from Waldo Braden, Executive Secretary, compiled by SAA's certified public accountants, shows that the Association had an annual income totaling $66,264.91 for the twelve months ending June 30. The comparable figure for the preceding year was $54,425.22 Never before has SAA reached into the over-$60,000 bracket.

Dr. Braden also shares with us a comment from James A. Winans, the second president of the Association, who recalls accompanying Howard Woodward, treasurer at that time, to settle with the hotel at the end of the convention. "The bill made him scan his checkbook,"

Professor Winans observed. "I think he had $2.87 left."

The Winans note also recalls a visit he once paid to the national office when it was in Columbia. He looked over the establishment with its desks, its typewriters, its filing cabinets, its ledgers, its assortment of beautiful and efficient secretaries, and wistfully remarked: "Once I walked down Michigan Boulevard with the total assets of the Association in my coat pocket." Waldo Braden could hardly do that today.

SPEAKERS OF THE YEAR have been announced by Tau Kappa Alpha as follows:

National affairs: Adlai Stevenson of Libertyville, Ill.

Business and commerce: Harlow H. Curtice, president of the General Motors Corporation.

Labor: George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO.

Religion: The Reverend George Buttrick, Harvard University

Educational, scientific, and cultural activities: Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt of Hyde Park, New York.

W. Charles Redding of Purdue University is chairman of the society's Board of Award. The panel for 1955 is the seventh that has made these awards.

FINAL PLANS ARE now being drawn at Stanford University for a new Speech and Hearing Clinic. Some 8,000 square feet of floor space are being allotted to the new clinic, equipped with facilities for both group and individual work in speech and hearing. Included are classrooms, offices for staff and assistants, library, a shop and phonetic laboratory, facilities for various types of hearing tests, and a sound-treated room for experimental work in acoustics. Other units to be housed in the building include Otology and Laryngology, Physical Therapy, Occupational Therapy, Neurology, and Clinical Psychology. Construction is slated to begin before the end of the year.

THE CHICAGO UNDERGRADUATE Division, University of Illinois, received a grant of $3,150 from the Educational Television and Radio Center for the production of thirteen 30-minute radio programs entitled "Success in the Arts." The objective of the series of programs was to indicate the nature of the creative process by which artistic works are produced. The format of the program consists of a panel including an artist, a college teacher, a critic, and a permanent master of ceremonies. Among the fields to be covered are fiction, acting, choreography, dance, poetry, architecture, painting, and music. Al Partridge, supervisor of radio and television for the University of Illinois in Chicago, is responsible for the program. The tape recordings will be distributed through the National Association of Educational Broadcasting.

NEW STAFF for the *QJS* has been announced by Donald C. Bryant, Washington University, editor-elect.

Contributing editors will be: Robert Gunderson, Oberlin College, book reviews; Richard Murphy, University of Illinois, Shop Talk; Loren Reid, University of Missouri, president's page.

Consulting editors will be: Marie Hochmuth, University of Illinois, rhetoric and criticism; Carroll Arnold, Cornell University, British public address; Leland Griffin, Northwestern University, American public Address; John V. Irvin, University of Wisconsin, speech and hearing; Claude L. Shaver, Louisiana State University, drama and the theatre; Douglas Ehninger, University of Florida, public speaking and forensics; Carl Dallinger, State University of Iowa, communications skills; David Potter, Michigan State University, business and professional speaking; Earnest Brandenburg, Washington University, adult education; Wallace A. Bacon, Northwestern University, interpretation; C. K. Thomas, Cornell University, phonetics; Warren Guthrie, Western Reserve University, TV and radio; Magdalene Kramer, Teachers College, Columbia University, teaching of speech; Robert D. Clark, University of Oregon, homiletics and preaching. One or two other positions are still to be filled.

CONCLUSION OF A SPEECH of Roy Jackson Bonds, sophomore at Northeast Mississippi Junior College, accepting the nomination as president pro tem of the senate, Southern Student Congress, Hattiesburg, April 5:

"If I should win this election, it is good; for it is good to win. But if I should not win, it is still good; for this is a democracy and in a democracy no one loses.

"This is just a practice congress, it is true; but we are practicing democracy, putting democracy into life and action. And democracy has a glory of its own."

SEVEN HUNDRED of America's educational leaders sought answers to the "crisis in education in

our day" at the eleventh annual national conference on Teacher Education and Professional Standards held in Parkland, Washington, June 26-30. High level teacher recruitment, improved teacher education, higher professional standards for teachers, stiffening of certification requirements, and greater research in problems of education were items of discussion at the conference, sponsored by the National Education Association.

Dr. Ralph W McDonald, president of Ohio's Bowling Green State University, set the theme for the conference in the keynote speech when he stated that even though selective teacher recruitment is important, the expected shortage of teachers is not a matter of preparing more capable teachers. "There are enough graduate teachers emerging from college this year to maintain a permanent career staff of two million teachers if teaching had the same holding power as other major professions."

Without exception the thirty study groups at the conference concluded that there should be a four year minimum training period for teaching, and a discontinuance of the "life" certificate. Dr. Lyman G. Ginger, dean, College of Adult and Extension Education, University of Kentucky, asked for a fair balance between Arts and Science courses and Education courses in the preparation of teachers. Courses in communication were suggested as essential in the broad development of social consciousness, of child psychology, of democratic understanding, and of economic knowhow.

The problem that must be faced today is three fold: (1) Recruiting high quality personnel; (2) training these teachers thoroughly in accredited institutions of learning; and (3) keeping qualified teachers in the classrooms for normal lifetime career service.

SAA was represented at the conference by President James M. Starr of Wenatchee Valley College, Wenatchee, Wash., who also served as leader of one of the study groups. Dr. Starr provided Shop Talk with the foregoing summary of the meeting.

IN HIS SPECIAL MESSAGE to Congress, January 12, President Eisenhower announced his intention of establishing a President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School. To present its analysis of the issues and problems of higher education confronting this committee the American Council on Education called a conference of its constituent members on March 19-20. J. Jeffery Auer, of the University of Virginia, editor of *Speech Monographs*, represented the Speech Association of America.

The problems of higher education in the next decade are easily dramatized in statistical form: the present record-breaking college enrollment of approximately 3,000,000 will likely double by 1965. If adequate physical facilities are to be provided for this vastly expanded student body, the conference foresaw an expenditure of thirteen billion in the next decade. And if the present ratio of students to teachers (13-1 is the national average) is to be maintained, the present college teaching force of approximately 190,000 will also need to be doubled by 1956.

A complete report of the conference proceedings will appear in an early issue of *The Educational Record*, the ACE quarterly. The summary conference statement appeared in *Higher Education*, 12 (April, 1956), and in *Higher Education and National Affairs*, 5 (March 23, 1956), and generally in the press.

SPEAKERS AT THE SUMMER University of Michigan Speech Conference included Waldo W. Braden, Louisiana State University; Gordon Peterson, University of Michigan; Harry K. Newburn, Educational Television and Radio Center; Loren Reid, University of Missouri; Lionel G. Crocker, Denison University; Kenneth G. Hance, Northwestern University; Wilbur E. Moore, Central Michigan College; Frank M. Whiting, University of Minnesota.

SAA PRESIDENT LESTER THONSSEN has appointed the following special committee to make a nomination for Executive Vice-President for the term 1958-60: William S. Howell, University of Minnesota; N. Edd Miller, University of Michigan; Carroll Arnold, Chairman, Cornell University.

Other committees appointed include:

Committee to delineate the boundaries between and the scope of SAA publications: Bower Aly, Dallas C. Dickey, Franklin H. Knower.

Committee to delineate the Life Membership fee: W. Norwood Brigance, Gail E. Densmore, Wayne C. Eubank.

Committee to investigate the feasibility of taking space in the NEA building in Washington: Karl R. Wallace, J. Jeffery Auer, Paul D. Bagwell, Orville A. Hitchcock, James H. McBurney.

Committee to determine the qualifications

for Emeritus Membership: Wilbur E. Gilman, Rupert L. Cortright, W. Hayes Yeager.

WINNER OF THE FIFTH annual National Contest in Public Discussion was the University of Virginia. Second place went to Wisconsin State College at Eau Claire and third place to Idaho State College. Thirty-eight colleges and universities prepared tape recordings to submit to a series of judging centers. The judges for the final contest were Winston Brembeck, University of Wisconsin; Hal Gulley, University of Illinois (Urbana); and J. V. Garland, Albion College. The national sponsor for the contest is Wayne N. Thompson, University of Illinois, Chicago Undergraduate Division, and the director of the contest for 1955-56 was Lenore E. Evans of the same institution.

The National Contest in Public Discussion is an annual event open to all colleges, universities, and junior colleges in the United States. The topic is the one chosen for national use. The deadline for the declaration of entry is November 15, and the tapes must be ready for shipment by December 1. Further information can be obtained by writing Dr. Thompson.

ONE OF THE MOST MODERN and efficient of the growing numbers of fine University theatres has been recently completed on the picturesque University of Alabama campus.

The theatre is the central unit of the new Music and Speech building, which was completed in the spring at an approximate total cost of $750,000. On either side of the theatre are three-story wings, the west wing housing the classrooms and offices of the Speech and Theatre staffs, the east wing containing similar facilities for the Music Department.

The entire building is built of steel and concrete and is faced with red brick. Located away from traffic noises, the building is backed by trees and an outdoor swimming pool. It occupies approximately 21,400 square feet of ground and, in keeping with the scheme of the University, has a Georgian façade of marble columns.

The building was designed by Paul M. Speake, architect of Van Keuren, Davis and Company, Birmingham, Alabama. Mr. Speake worked closely with the faculty in planning the various features of the building and a unique experience of cooperation was achieved by all. Numerous suggestions made by T. Earle Johnson, speech department head; Marian Gallaway, theatre director; and Gene Wilson, technical director, were adapted by the architects into the space budget to provide unexecIled facilities. Alabama now offers 22 courses in dramatics leading to the B.A. and the M.A. in speech. Dramatics has been offered since 1907, and productions have been given in Morgan Auditorium, built in 1912. Now, for the first time, dramatics has found a home in a specially-designed theatre.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND Overseas Program, now well-established in Europe, England, North Africa, the Middle East, and the North Atlantic area, will now offer university-level courses to military personnel stationed in Japan, Okinawa, and Korea. Classes began this semester under the administrative supervision of A. J. Prahl, a member of the University of Maryland staff at College Park, who for two years served as director of the Overseas Program in Europe. Announcement of the new plan was made by the Far East Command, following a visit there by Ray Ehrensberger, dean of the College of Special and Continuation Studies of the University of Maryland, who surveyed the educational facilities in the Far East and studied the overall requirements for courses.

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH debaters will be among the nation's best informed when they complete the requirements laid down by their director, Robert P. Newman.

Professor Newman's plan provides for the reading of ten books each year. The list is intriguing enough to include the titles suggested for the first two years:

First year: Chase, *Tyranny of Words;* Durant, *The Story of Philosophy;* Heilbroner, *The Worldly Philosophers;* Highet, *The Art of Teaching;* Kluckhorn, *Mirror for Man;* Morison and Commager, *Growth of the American Republic;* Orwell, *1984;* Reisman, *The Lonely Crowd;* Ruby, *The Art of Making Sense.*

Second year: Aron, *Century of Total War;*

NOTE TO SHOP TALK CONTRIBUTORS

News for the December *QJS* should be sent to Loren Reid, University of Missouri, before November 15. After that date please send your items to the new editor of Shop Talk: Professor Richard Murphy, University of Illinois, Urbana.

Beard, *Rise of American Civilization;* Cassirer, *The Myth of the State;* Dewey, *Reconstruction in Philosophy;* Gamow, *One, Two, Three . . . Infinity;* Hook, *The Hero in History,* Kennan, *American Diplomacy, 1900-1950;* Smith, *Man and His Gods;* Toynbee, *A Study in History* (abridged); Warren, *All the King's Men.*

Titles are also suggested for the third and fourth years. The plan is outlined in a four-page folder which Professor Newman will no doubt be glad to send to those interested. The idea is worth a good deal of reflection.

IN THE MAIL RECENTLY was a big envelope from Waldo Braden, enclosing a form inviting us to renew our membership in SAA and also bring up to date our entry in SAA's *Directory.*

That brought back a tidal wave of memories, reaching to the fall of 1947. Getting out the *Directory* had always been a time-consuming and ingenuity-taxing job in the national office. Our helpers would start typing the list of members in October, and by the time the job was finished in November, many of the names had dropped, many more had been added, and still others had changed addresses. So one noon we left home, having finished a troubled luncheon with the *Directory* much in mind, and started a slow walk back to school.

For a whole block we formulated and clarified the problem, viz.: What can be done about the blankety-blank *Directory?* For another block we amassed solutions, viz., Throw it in the Missouri. After all, it had not seemed to receive the attention that the labor of preparing it invited. Some questioned its value. But other people, nameless now forevermore, suggested augmenting it with new information. That idea took hold, and as we walked the remaining blocks we visualized a *Directory* containing not only names and addresses, but information about degrees and special interests.

It was already much too late in the fall to start an ambitious project, so we went ahead with it, anyway. We drafted a set of forms such as might be mailed to the membership to collect information. Previously, all the data needed had been taken from subscription records! We wrote out imaginary entries, such as might appear opposite the names of elementary school, high school, and college teachers—and of persons who were not connected with any association. We calculated the lines per entry and the number of additional pages that the *Directory* would require. We got preliminary bids and called members of the Finance Committee. The Finance Committee has always been an adventuresome group, and everybody said, "Go ahead."

So we mailed out 5,000 or more letters containing *Directory* information forms. As an afterthought, we tucked in an invitation to pay up dues. As another afterthought, we wrote in the date of expiration, so each member could see where he was paid up to.

In a few days the blanks began to come back. Most of them were written in longhand. Problems of editing arose, so varied were the entries. Some members, asked to set down their specialties, wrote in a dozen, plus a list of their publications. A good deal of additional information was supplied that we had not even asked for. Obviously it was out of the question to print everything submitted. We ended up by retyping practically every item that was turned in.

But how the cash poured in! Nearly every envelope contained money. Sustaining mem-

---

SHOP TALK CALENDAR

Speech Association of America, American Forensic Association, National Society for the Study of Communication, Committee on Discussion and Debate Materials: Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, December 27-29, 1956. Some committee, council, and legislative assembly meetings on December 26. American Educational Theatre Association, same place, Dec. 28-30. Some council and committee meetings on Dec. 27.

Central States Speech Association: Hotel Leamington, Minneapolis, April 5-6, 1957; Hotel Sherman, Chicago, December 27-28, 1957.

New England Speech Association: Hotel Statler, Boston, November 23-24.

American Speech and Hearing Association: Palmer House, Chicago, November 19-21.

Southern Speech Association: University of Georgia Center for Continuing Education, Athens, April 1-5.

Other conventions for the Speech Association of America are now scheduled as follows:

1957: Hotel Statler, Boston, August 25-28. (with AETA.)

1958: Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, December 29-31.

1959: Hotel Statler, Washington, December 28-30.

1960: The Jefferson, St. Louis, December 28-30.

bers increased in number. Our bookkeeper, a GI wife, started working evenings. In the whole office we all suddenly felt as if we were working for a Going Concern. One day we announced to our own family, "we've got five thousand dollars in the bank." Their faces lighted, only to fall a trifle when they realized that the head of the house was just talking shop.

Eventually the copy was prepared, the type was set, and the long job of proof reading began. The opportunities for making mistakes were fearful, working as we did with so much complicated copy written in longhand. Came the day when the *Directory* was printed, packaged, and mailed. We estimated that we would receive a hundred letters of anguished criticism. Instead, we received no criticism at all. If we made mistakes, and we must have made many, nobody seemed to mind. A lot of people wrote commendatory notes. And for weeks the monotonous flow of cash and checks continued.

In the years that have followed, the *Directory* has become one of the important publications of the *Association*. Each year sees it a little larger, and with additional improvements. The annual request for *Directory* information, combined with a drive for renewals, puts the Association in a good position to bear its extremely heavy fall expenses.

This is a good place to announce that in the measured judgment of Shop Talk, everybody who wants to stand up and be counted should get into Waldo Braden's 1957 *Directory*. College and university majors should join up also. Authors of books should see that they are listed in the *Directory's* Bibliography, so that all current titles will be readily in the public view. Quite possibly no one fully realizes the wide variety of reasons that leads members of the profession to consult this volume. Many busy men in the profession keep it at deskside, available for reference. We wish the Executive Secretary success in his current campaign for information and checks, and hope that he gets huge quantities of both.

LOOKING OVER THE NEWS in a large county-seat weekly, Shop Talk noted that every one of a dozen new appointees to the school system there was a "Mrs." For the time being at least, the married women of the community are rescuing the public school system from its current drastic shortage of teachers.

If we were a school superintendent, we would call the senior girls together and urge them to get college degrees and go into teaching. We would invite them to get married and come back to the old home town to live and to teach in the public schools. We would even show them what a contract looks like. We would also have a meeting of the senior boys and give them the same discussion with a different slant. In other words we would start ourselves a farm and train our own recruits. If we were a department chairman we would look over our majors and hand out graduate scholarships—as well as to those of other colleges that we could reach.

"Nepotism" and "in-breeding" used to be the ugly, four-letter words of the academician; and "As inbred as a can of worms" was the phrase used to describe a long-established system. The words are still in the language, but administrators can now be more relaxed as they utter them.

THE NEW CHAIRMAN of the Department of Speech and Dramatic Art at the State University of Iowa is H. Clay Harshbarger, who succeeds the late E. C. Mabie. Orville A. Hitchcock will be in charge of Public Discussion; Arnold S. Gillette will be Director of University Theatre, in charge of Dramatic Art; Sam L. Becker will be Director of Television, in charge of Radio-Television-Film. Carl A. Dallinger will be coordinator for the Communication Skills program, New appointees in the department are Oscar G. Brockett, assistant professor in dramatic art; David G. Schaal, assistant professor in radio-television-film; Donald N. Dedmon, instructor in public discussion. James F. Curtis is head of the Department of Speech Pathology and Audiology.

NEW HAVEN STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE sponsored various summer workshops and conferences. A. C. LaFollette of Ohio University participated in the summer program and directed the workshops in lipreading, audiometry, and hearing problems. A one-day conference entitled "The Teacher Works With Speech in the Classroom" was well attended. Appearing on the program were Dr. LaFollette; William Formaad, director of the Speech Improvement Laboratory at New Haven; Dr. Magdalene Kramer, Teachers College, Columbia, University; and a panel consisting of Robert Kendall, New Haven State Teachers College; Brobury Ellis, New Britain State Teachers College; Harold Saleh, Hamden schools; William Foley, New Haven State Teachers College. Professor Formaad is assisted at New Haven by Celest Hocs, speech and hearing consultant in the Hamden public schools.

THEATRE SCHEDULES

Bowling Green State University: Summer: *The Drunkard, Barretts of Wimpole Street, My Sister Eileen, Night Must Fall, The Happy Time, Oklahoma.*

Evansville College: *Pygmalion, The Corn Is Green, Eager Heart, Therese.*

Fairmont State College: *Glass Menagerie, Time Out for Ginger, The Man, The Rainmaker.*

Long Island University: *The Adding Machine, Ghosts, Out of This World, Oedipus Rex.*

Texas Christian University: *State of the Union, The Judge, Imaginary Invalid, Desperate Hours.* Horned Frog Community Summer Theatre: *The Happy Time, Come Back Little Sheba, The Rainmaker, Misalliance.*

West Virginia University: Summer: *The Moon Is Blue.* Academic year: *Seven Year Itch, Taming of the Shrew, Death of a Salesman, Sabrina Fair.*

APPOINTMENTS

Bowling Green State University: Elden T. Smith, director of student activities; Donald C. Kleckner, chairman of the Department of Speech; Eugene M. Batza, assistant professor of speech and hearing therapy.

Brown University: Janice O. Van De Water, director of dramatics.

Cornell University: Lee Adey, instructor of speech; Ben A. Chappell, Marilyn L. Erter, Sheldon W. Halpern, B. Dale Lauder, Richard R. Smyth, Forrest D. Tucker, James A. Wood, graduate assistants.

Long Island University: Burton Schaber, therapist in the community speech clinic.

Los Angeles State College: Robert Kully, assistant professor of speech and director of forensics; Louise Binder Scott, assistant professor of speech; Edward Fitzgerald, assistant professor of drama.

Miami University: Elaine DuCharme, associate Dean of Women.

Tarkio College: Lois Chaney, head of the Speech department.

Teachers College, Columbia University: Kathryn England, assistant in the Speech Rehabilitation Laboratory, spring session; Elizabeth Caughran, visiting assistant professor, summer session, Naomi Filler, assistant in the Speech Rehabilitation Laboratory, academic year 1955-56.

Texas Christian University: Clayton Fields, Jr., director of technical theatre and assistant professor; William Garber, instructor in speech-theatre.

Universiy of Illinois in Chicago: Barbara Jipson, radio and television staff.

University of Maryland: Thomas R. McManus, instructor of speech; Martin T. Todaro, junior instructor of speech.

West Virginia University: Walter Rockenstein, instructor in speech; Virgil Gray, instructor in speech; Eleanor E. George, part-time instructor in speech, part-time teacher in the public schools.

State Teachers College, Geneseo: John P. Moncur, chairman of the Department of Speech.

Northwestern University: Leland M. Griffin, Wayne Minnick, associate professors of public speaking; Jack C. Ellis, assistant professor of film; James F. Jerger, assistant professor of audiology; John C. Edwards, instructor in interpretation; Laura L. Lee, instructor in speech correction; David Rutherford, instructor in speech correction; Russel Windes, instructor in public speaking.

Washington University: Donald C. Bryant, chairman of the Department of English, including dramatics, speech, and journalism; William Harlan Shaw, assistant professor of dramatics, technical theatre; Edwin Black, instructor in speech.

PROMOTIONS

Evansville College: Virgil G. Logan, professor of speech.

Long Island University: Dennis Brown, professor.

Los Angeles State College: Robert Douglass, associate professor of speech.

West Virginia University: Betty Ruth Phillips, assistant professor of speech.

Northwestern University: Glen E. Mills, assistant dean; Robert S. Breen, associate professor of interpretation; John H. Gaeth, associate professor of audiology; Franklyn S. Haiman, associate professor of public speaking.

PERSONALS

Mildred F. Berry of Rockford College has received a Fulbright lectureship in speech pathology for six months in Denmark. She will be affiliated with the University of Copenhagen and the Society for Crippled Children in Copenhagen . . . Carrie Rasmussen of the Madison public schools taught Drury College's first speech courses this last summer.